WYCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 02875 7714

THE CHURCH, THE MINISTRY, THE SACRAMENTS.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

LIBRARY

Wycliffe College

TORONTO

Shelf No. BV4253 P42

Register No. 2483

Jan. 1886

PLEASE RETURN
TO
T. R. O'MEARA.

THE CHURCH, THE MINISTRY, THE SACRAMENTS.

FIVE SERMONS,

PREACHED IN PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL,

BY

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D.,

DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

1883.

LONDON ; J. NISBET & Co, ; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & Co.
CAMBRIDGE : DEIGHTON, BELL & Co.
PETERBOROUGH : GEO. C. CASTER, MARKET PLACE.

[*All Rights Reserved.*]

45205756 ✓

PETERBOROUGH:

GEO. C. CASTER, PRINTER, MARKET-PLACE.

PREFACE.

These Sermons are published in compliance with an earnest request addressed to me by a considerable number of those who heard them preached. They were not written with any view to publication, but I have the less hesitation in publishing them, because they deal with subjects concerning which, as I believe, a vast amount of false teaching is current. A theology is become popular and dominant in the Church which I am fully persuaded is neither in accordance with Scripture, nor with the plain teaching of our Prayer Book. This theology professes to rest upon the teaching of the Fathers, but picks and culls from their often discordant testimonies such passages only as suits its purposes. It leans to Rome and changes the meaning of language to put upon Protestant formularies a Romish interpretation. Against this disingenuous theology no protest can be too clear or too emphatic. We must blot out history, we must evacuate the language of our greatest divines of all meaning, we must suppose that they were "fighting with shadows, understanding neither what they defended nor what

they assailed," if we are to believe that there is no vital difference between ourselves and Rome. This difference does exist ; it cannot be obliterated. The idea of the Church, the nature of the Ministry, the virtue of the Sacraments,—on all these points the distinction is broad and palpable. This I have endeavoured to show in the following Sermons.

I have asserted that theory of the Catholic Church which was maintained and acted upon by our Reformers, and some of our greatest divines, which is expressly maintained by Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which is over and over again asserted in the plainest language by our own Church. In the words of the Bidding Prayer in our Canons, I hold that the Catholic Church is "the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world."

I have insisted on that view of the Christian Ministry which regards it as a Divine institution, but denies that it is invested with a Sacerdotal character; which accepts Apostolical succession as a fact in history, but does not turn it into a doctrine, making the grace of the Sacraments depend upon it. I adhere firmly to the triple order as the best form of Church government, but I do not hold that it is necessary to the existence of a Church. In this respect, my posi-

tion does not differ from that of one of our most learned living Prelates, Bishop Lightfoot, in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians. Thomas Arnold, Richard Whately, Julius Charles Hare, are great names on the same side of the question.

I believe in Baptismal Regeneration, in that sense in which it was explained by Hammond and Waterland, and more recently by one of the greatest Prelates who ever adorned the Bench, the late Bishop Thirlwall.

I accept without reservation,—neither adding thereto, nor taking aught from it,—that doctrine of the Lord's Supper which is expressly taught in our Articles, and in our Catechism, and not less plainly set forth in our Communion Service. Our Church says not one word of a Real Presence or of a Eucharistic Sacrifice, and no loyal Churchman is bound to employ these terms, or to hold the doctrines which they are supposed to imply. Nor can there be anything more glaringly illogical than to assert, that there is a "Catholic doctrine" of the Real Presence or of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, when the Church of England has pronounced no opinion on the one point or on the other. If the Church of England is a part of the Catholic Church, that cannot be a Catholic doctrine which she has not made her own.

The explanation which I have adopted of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is that which Dr. Vogan has maintained with so much learning and ability in his "True Doctrine of the Eucharist." Though different in formal statement it agrees essentially with the views of Waterland.

The teaching of the Oxford School looks Romeward, and is conspicuously modern. It is certain that it is not primitive. Even if it had the support in antiquity which is claimed for it, I should still say, Scripture is before the Fathers, and the Church of England is not bound by them. But it has not; the earliest evidence is the other way.

It will be said that in my recoil from Rome I have made too large concessions to Nonconformity. I am not afraid of the charge. I believe firmly that the Church of England both in her Liturgy and in her Articles is much nearer both to the Reformed Churches abroad (as has been again and again acknowledged by Bishops and Divines at and since the Reformation), and to the great Nonconforming communities at home, than she is to the Romish Church, or to the Greek Church. I believe that unity of doctrine is more than unity of government, and unity of faith and life more than unity of ritual and ceremonies. And

if "the hideous sin of schism" be held up to startle and terrify us when we would draw near to these our brethren who have departed from us, forgetting the mother that bare them, then I say, the sin of schism may not be theirs only but ours also; there may be a divided responsibility, we may not have quite clean hands. And if Protestant dissenters have been guilty of schism, Romish dissenters have been not less guilty. And further, we know that an impassable gulf separates us from the Church of Rome; whereas no impassable gulf separates us from the Nonconforming Churches. We can meet on common platforms for common ends; we may acknowledge freely the bond of a common faith; and if we cannot unite in all things we may at least forbear one another in love. So long indeed as so-called religious newspapers* keep alive the spirit of intolerance and animosity, we shall be kept asunder. But thank God there is a nobler

* It would be vain to look for a Christian spirit or even ordinary courtesy and fairness in certain papers, which carry conspicuously the name of "Church" on their forehead. Happily there are others whose tone towards Nonconformists is neither bitter nor contemptuous. I know less of the Nonconformist press, but I have been painfully struck by the want of charity manifest in some portions of it, by the desire to exaggerate the defects and failures of the National Church and almost to exult over her difficulties. I ought, however, to add that I have never seen any indications of this spirit in the Wesleyan or Methodist press.

spirit abroad. The spirit of love is casting out the spirit of hate and jealousy.† I do not anticipate the speedy breaking down of all barriers. I do not expect that the Church will absorb other communities. But I do look for freer mutual intercourse, for a larger tolerance, for a more joyful recognition of Christian fellowship. The good Lord pardon us all for our past misunderstandings, and heal our divisions, and enable us if we cannot agree in externals to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace!

DEANERY, PETERBOROUGH,

22nd March, 1883.

† The noble efforts of Earl Nelson and those who are united with him in the work of Home Re-union deserve the most grateful acknowledgement.

THE CHURCH.

EPHESIANS i., 23.

"Which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all."

"I believe in the holy Catholic Church." "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church." This is what we say as often as we repeat our Creed. These sentences are a part of the profession of our faith as Christians. At our entrance into the Church by Baptism we pledge ourselves to one of these forms of belief; at every participation of the Holy Communion we take the other upon our lips. Sunday by Sunday and week-day by weekday, in every service, one or the other, or both of these forms, is repeated by us in our public worship. Surely then it is of some importance that we should understand clearly what we mean by these words. They are not an idle form; and it can never be a matter of indifference how we understand an article of our belief; for, if we do not understand it, we cannot hold it aright. Better not to repeat the articles of our faith at all than to repeat them carelessly or ignorantly, not knowing what we say. To do this is to mock God. And the Creeds, it must be remem-

bered, are not like our own 39 Articles, or the Confessions of other Reformed Churches, or the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent, of a merely local character, binding only particular communions; but they are a summary of Christian doctrine which has been very generally if not universally received. It is true that the earliest Creed in which any reference to the Church occurs is that of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in the middle of the third century; and that Creed, after reciting a belief in the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, continues: "I believe in the remission of sins and eternal life through the Holy Church," "the Holy Church" not being placed apart as a distinct clause of the Creed, but still a belief in it being implied as the instrument and channel whereby we obtain the blessings of the Gospel, viz.: remission of sins and eternal life. In the next century, however, "the Holy Church" occupies a recognized place as a truth that all Christians confess and believe. And at length, in the middle of the fifth century, "the Holy Catholic Church" for the first time appears as a distinct article of what we call the Apostles' Creed. It is at the same time that in the Fourth General Council of Chalcedon (451) the article of "the Holy Catholic Church" was amongst those added to the original Nicene Creed, which, as is well known, ended with the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." But whatever the antiquity of this particular clause in question may be, our own Church has accepted the two forms of the Creed in which it is confessed, and I suppose there is scarcely any body of Christians which would not consent to the articles of what is called the Apostles' Creed.* Certainly the very great importance attached in Holy Scripture to the Church justifies this addition of the article of the Creed. The

* An eminent and learned Congregationalist minister has said, "In the language of the Ancient Creed,—although it uses a phrase which we find not in the Holy Book, yet if allowed to put upon it our own meaning —and the meaning is in accord with the plain and grammatical sense of the words—we can most heartily and unreservedly join, and can *ex animo* repeat the confession, 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church.'"—*Christian Union*, by Samuel Newth, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London, p. 13.

existence of a great corporate body, of a society of believers is a fact. We cannot stand alone; Christ did not intend us to stand alone; He did not call us to an isolated selfish life. He did found a Church, and when at the first great Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit thousands were converted at a sermon, they were not a mere loose aggregation of units, but "the Lord added to *the Church* daily such as were in the state of salvation." The baptism which He instituted was not merely the consecration of the individual, it was the seal of admission into the community of Christians, into the fellowship of the body of Christ. Through one Church, as members of the Church, as members of that body of which Christ is the Head, we obtain remission of sins and everlasting life.

But what is this Church of which the Creeds speak as one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic? Where is it to be found? What is this Church in which we profess our belief? The English word Church denotes properly "the Lord's house," not of course the material building, but the spiritual building, which, compacted by that which every joint supplieth, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord. But the New Testament word which we render "Church" is the Greek equivalent of a Hebrew word which denotes the whole congregation of Israel. It means simply an assembly. The word, however, is used in three different applications. (1) It is used of the whole body of believers in all times and in all places, as when our Lord said, pointing to Himself, "On this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it;" or, as when St. Paul describes it as "the pillar and ground of the Faith." (2) It is used next of the Churches or assemblies of Christians in particular localities, as when we read of the Church of Jerusalem, or the Churches of Asia or Galatia, or the Church that is in Corinth. (3) It is used lastly even of a single family, or of the small number of believers who might be gathered with a family for religious instruction and worship, as when St. Paul speaks of the Church that is in the house of Priscilla and Aquila, or salutes the Church in the house of Philemon. With these two latter senses of the word Church we are not immediately concerned now, as

it is obvious that the language of the Creed does not apply to them. The Church in which we believe is the Catholic, *i.e.* the universal Church, and although the term is not found in Scripture, and consequently some early heretics objected to the introduction of the term into the Creeds, still it is a term which sufficiently describes the Church according to the light in which Scripture presents it to us.

But now, when we carefully study the language of Scripture as it refers to the whole society, the assembly or congregation of believers, we are struck at once with the two different aspects in which the Christian society is regarded. On the one hand it is regarded as a visible society, as an external body or federation, comprising all who name the name of Christ, whether sincere in their profession or not. Viewed in this light it presents a mixed character. Thus, for instance, the Kingdom of Heaven, by which our Lord denotes the visible Church is likened to a field in which the wheat and the tares grow together until the harvest, and to a net which gathers fishes of all kinds, both good and bad. By these parables he intends us to understand that there will be at all times a visible community of professing Christians distinct from the world. On the other hand, our Lord uses language applicable strictly not to all, but only to a part, of the community. He speaks as it were of a Church within a Church, a body not visible but invisible. These are the living branches in the true vine. These are the sheep which know and follow Him and hear His voice, and to them He gives eternal life, and them none shall pluck out of His hand. These are they for whom He prays and not for the world. These are they whom the Father hath given Him, and of whom He wills that they be with Him where He is, that they may behold His glory. These are they who are governed and sanctified by His Spirit. These are they who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. This is that Church of which we read such glorious things in Holy Writ. This is that Church of living stones which is built up a holy temple unto the Lord, builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. This is that Church which is the mystical

body of Christ, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. This is that Church through which is made known unto principalities and powers the manifold wisdom of God. This is that Church of which we are told that Christ loved it, and gave Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word; that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. This is that general assembly and church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven. This is that great multitude which no man can number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples, and tongues, which stand before the throne and before the Lamb arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands, who cry with a loud voice, saying, "Salvation unto our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." (Rev. vii., 9, 10). It is this Church, in which, as Luther long ago contended, we properly believe; for we do not believe that which we see. We acknowledge the existence of the external visible community. It is set as a witness before the world. It is "the house of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." In its first and original constitution it was so in a very marked degree. Every separate assembly of Christians was a Church as distinct from the heathen by whom they were surrounded, and all these companies of Christian believers were regarded as constituting Christ's one holy Church, that Church concerning which it is said, "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." But though there was in this sense a visible unity or visible Church, set as a city upon a hill, amidst the darkness of heathenism, even the visible Church itself was always so to speak a grand ideal. It was a splendid vision of the inward Spirit, expressing itself in a form of outward symmetry and beauty. But except as an ideal, except as a vision, the perfect outward symmetry and beauty have never yet been seen, because the professing Church and the true Church have never yet been co-extensive. The magnificent conception of the

perfect spiritual temple in all its majestic proportions has never been realised. You can see the great outline, you can admire the grand simplicity and the marvellous harmony of the design, as you may in the material Church in which we are gathered this evening; but as in that there is the crushed and defaced pillar, and the ugly rents and fissures and gaps even in the central tower, so the visible Church of Christ has been torn by heresies and schisms, her very safety threatened, her very central tower shaken and ready to fall, had not the Hand of God stayed up her pillars and repaired her ruins. The language of Scripture is plain and explicit. It speaks both of a visible and an invisible body; the one the outward image, the other the inward and hidden reality. It regards the Church of Christ as one, because it is His body of which, as we read in the Epistle this morning, we are all members in particular. And there is no other bond of union laid down in Holy Scripture than this, "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling," no other condition of union than this, that we have all been baptized unto Jesus Christ, that we are all united to Him by a living faith, that in His Name we all worship one God, the Father of us all.

And now what is the doctrine of the Church of England? Has she in any wise departed from the simplicity of Scripture? Has she invented any other definition of the Church? Has she laid down any other conditions of union and communion? Does she refer us to a visible head upon earth as the Church of Rome does? Or does she insist upon one form of government, as that of Bishops deriving their succession from the Apostles? What is the language of her 19th Article? "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful (*i.e.* believing) men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that are of necessity requisite to the same." But she has not laid down what those things are that are of necessity requisite to the due administration of the Sacraments; and it is certain that our Reformers were in communion with the Presbyterian Churches abroad, and that the validity of Presbyterian orders was

recognized by some of our most orthodox prelates and divines.* In the Prayer Book we pray for "the good estate of the Catholic Church," which is immediately after explained as "all who profess and call themselves Christians." In the service of the Holy Communion we thank God that we are "very members incorporate in the mystical body of His Son, which is the blessed company of *all* faithful (*i.e.* believing) people." In the very Ember Week Prayer we address God as having "purchased to Himself an universal Church by the precious blood of His dear Son," and no one would seriously maintain that the benefits of Christ's redemption are limited only to certain communities of Christians. And finally, in the Bidding Prayer, as it stands in the Canons of the Church of England, and as you have just heard it read, Christ's Holy Catholic Church is defined as "the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world."

Neither Holy Scripture then nor the Church of England considers any external polity as necessary to the existence of this one Catholic Church, and this has been freely acknowledged by some of the greatest Divines of the Church of England. I will quote two: Richard Hooker, famous for his moderation as well as for his learning, and Bishop Pearson, whose work on the Creed is acknowledged on all hands to be a standard work.

What does Hooker say of the Catholic Church? Does he tie it down to Apostolical succession and Episcopal government? Most assuredly not. He draws first of all a distinction between

* Thus Bishop Andrewes writes to Du Moulin: "If our form of Church government is of Divine order, it does not follow either that there is no salvation without it, or that the Church cannot stand without it. He must be blind who does not see Churches keep their position without it, he must be made of iron who denies them salvation. We are not such hearts of iron; we draw a wide distinction here. A thing which is of divine right (at least in external government) may yet be wanting without peril to salvation." And although he objected at first to the consecration of the Scottish Bishops, saying that they must first be ordained presbyters, as not having received ordination from a bishop, yet when Archbishop Bancroft observed "that thereof there was no necessity, seeing where Bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful, otherwise it might be doubted, if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed Churches," he did not insist upon the objection. In 1669 John Durel writes, "Nor did Morton, Bishop of Durham, consent to set apart by a fresh ordination ministers of foreign churches."

the Church visible and the Church invisible. The everlasting promises of God's love, mercy, and blessedness belong, he says, only to this latter—the mystical Church. On the other hand, "when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company. And this visible Church is but one continuing from the first beginning of the world to the last end." . . . "And so the Apostle affirms (he continues) of all Christians that, be they Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, they are all incorporated into one company, they all make but *one body*." And in what does he declare this unity to consist? In Episcopacy? In the Apostolical succession? No, but "in that uniformity which all several persons thereunto belonging have by reason of that *one Lord*, whose servants they all profess themselves, that *one Faith* which they all acknowledge, that *one Baptism* wherewith they are all initiated. The visible Church of Jesus Christ is therefore one, in outward profession of those things which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required in every particular Christian man." "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, in whomsoever these things are, the Church (says Hooker) doth acknowledge them for her children." And he proceeds to maintain that even heretics and evil livers, so long as they make a profession of being Christians, are members of the visible Church, and that the opinion of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, that the baptism of heretics was no baptism was condemned as false by the Council of Nicæa, and was subsequently retracted by many who had previously held it and taught it. And now I turn to Bishop Pearson. In his comment on "the Holy Catholic Church" he mentions certain notes or marks by which the Church is known, and amongst them he mentions "unity of discipline and government" as one, but he does not say *what* that government is, but only that there must be an order and a ministry where there is a Church; and when at the close he sums up what is requisite to be believed in order to a right faith concerning the Church, he sums it up thus, omitting all reference to the ministry: "I am fully persuaded and make a free

confession of this, as of a necessary and infallible truth, that Christ by the preaching of the Apostles did gather unto Himself a Church consisting of thousands of believing persons and numerous congregations, to which He daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add to the same unto the end of the world; so that by the virtue of His all-sufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, and now is, and hereafter shall be, so long as the sun and moon endure, a Church of Christ, one and the same. This Church I believe in general holy in respect of the author, end, institution, and administration of it: particularly in the members, here I acknowledge it really, and in the same hereafter perfectly holy. I look upon this Church, not like that of the Jews, limited to one people, confined to one nation, but by the appointment and command of Christ, and by the efficacy of His assisting power, to be disseminated through all nations, to be extended to all places, to be propagated to all ages, to contain in it all truths necessary to be known, to exact absolute obedience from all men to the commands of Christ, and to furnish us with all graces necessary to make our persons acceptable and our actions well-pleasing in the sight of God. And thus I believe THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH."

We are now, I think, in a position to judge of a certain other theory of the Catholic Church, which is now commonly maintained among us, maintained with the most amazing audacity, and with the most complete disregard of facts, as well as of the clearest statements of our own Church, and in defiance of the whole tenour of Scripture.

And, that I may be guilty of no misrepresentation or exaggeration, I shall appeal to an unexceptionable authority. Cardinal Newman has recently told us what that theory is as it was commonly maintained in Oxford forty years ago. The theory is this: Government by Bishops is essential to the existence of the Church; only through Bishops, who have derived their orders in direct unbroken succession from the Apostles, is the grace of the Sacraments given. When we look abroad on the face of Christendom, we see three ancient venerable and widely-spread communities which have this in common, that

they are all under Episcopal government. They differ on the most important questions of doctrine and discipline. They have very different rites and ceremonies, but they have this one thing in common—Bishops deriving their succession from the Apostles. Hence they have the grace of the Sacraments. Therefore they are true Churches, and not so much three separate Churches as different aspects of the one Catholic Church. Accordingly he who is a member of any one of these Churches is in a certain sense a member of all. In Rome, therefore, he would communicate with the Romish Church; in Russia, with the Greek Church; in England, with the Anglican Church; and if he did not he would be guilty of the "hideous sin of schism."* This is the theory gravely held and confidently taught by Christian ministers, and accepted by Christian men as if it was a matter of course. And yet, just think of the monstrous conclusions to which I am driven if I am to accept this theory. I am to accept the Greek Church as a true Church, though for ages she has been sunk in ignorance, in the grossest and most grovelling superstitions; I am to accept the Church of Rome as a true Church, though she be drunk with the blood of the martyrs, defiled with crimes at which humanity shudders, and the parent of all the horrors of the Inquisition, and though some of her Infallible Popes have been

* In his Preface to Palmer's "Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church," Cardinal Newman says that Palmer had been convinced of the truth of "a visible Church—one, individual and integral—Catholic as spread over the earth, Apostolic as coeval with the Apostles of Christ, and Holy as being the dispenser of his Word and Sacraments," and "considered it at present to exist in three main branches, or rather in a triple presence, the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglican, these being one and the same Church, distinguishable from each other only by secondary, fortuitous, and local, though important characteristics." Further, he believed that "Each of the three in turn was the whole Church," there being no difference between them except the external accident of place; and as "on a given territory there could not be more than one of the three, it followed that Christians generally wherever they were, were bound to recognize and had a claim to be recognized by that one, ceasing to belong to the Anglican Church as Anglican when they were at Rome, and ignoring Rome as Rome when they found themselves at Moscow." "Not to acknowledge this was bad logic," "to act in opposition to it was nothing short of setting up altar against altar, that is, the hideous sin of schism and a sacrilege," . . . . "this is what was held and professed in Oxford 40 years ago." Of course it followed that the Reformation rested on bad logic, and that the Reformers were guilty of the hideous sin of schism and a sacrilege. Dr. Littledale has recently given us some excellent "Reasons" for taking a different view.

heretics and unbelievers, and others men whose gigantic crimes have startled the world; but I am not to accept the Lutheran Church of Germany as a true Church and a branch of the Catholic Church, though the Spirit of God has dwelt mightily in her, and though her theologians have been the foremost of her age; and I am not to accept the Wesleyan Church as a branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, though its missionaries with their lives in their hands have converted the cannibals of Fiji, and brought the whole native population to sit at the feet of Jesus; and I am not to accept the Baptist Church as a true branch of Christ's Holy Church, though its missionaries gave to India the first translation of the Scriptures into a native dialect; and I am not to accept the Congregationalist Churches as parts of the Catholic Church, though the martyrs of Madagascar were the seal and the crown of the missionaries of the London Missionary Society. And all because these men are schismatics, and the ordination of their pastors is not a valid ordination, as if there were not other parts of Church order and Church government quite as necessary in their full development to the existence of a Church as its government by Bishops.* Looked at in the light

* "One might have thought," said Julius Charles Hare some thirty years ago, "one might have thought that the heart and mind of the Church, that the Christian spirit of the English nation, would have revolted from such a notion; one might have thought that nothing less than absolute necessity, nothing less than the plainest, most explicit, most cogent, most irrefragable testimony of God's Word, would have induced a sober-minded Christian to admit such a doctrine into his mind." "As to Episcopacy, the utmost that can with reason be said is that it is requisite to the perfection of the Church. But so too, is the full development of all the other elements of the Church, of the Presbyterian element, of the Diaconate in its true original import, and of the laity as taking their appropriate part in all matters concerning the life and government of the Church. The rightful development of each of these great organs of the life of the Church is to the full as important as that of the Episcopate; and if we do not refuse the title of a Church to a body where others of these organs are imperfectly developed, or maimed, or latent, we have no right to refuse it to a body where the Episcopal element—*which manifestly is of less moment than any of the others* for the actual life of the Church—is wanting. If the body holds to the one Head, and is animated by the one faith, and is sanctified by the one baptism, it is a Church before God, and woe to us if we deny that it is so. Our denial will recoil on our own heads, and we shall only cut ourselves off from the blessings of Christian communion with those by whose faith and knowledge and love we might otherwise be instructed and edified."—*Mission of the Comforter*, p. 1008.

of facts, looked at in the light of Scripture, looked at in the light of the plain and repeated declarations of the Church of England, looked at in the light of Christian charity and common sense, this theory breaks to pieces. The idol lies shattered and crushed in the dust, like Dagon before the Ark of God's Truth.

Do not let me be misunderstood. I love the Church of England from the ground of my heart, I value her Liturgy and her orders, I was born in her communion, I have drawn strength and comfort from the breast of her consolations, I shall die in her communion, and pray that my last hours may be comforted by her prayers and her Sacraments. I believe her to be the purest of all Churches—the nearest of all to the Apostolic model; grand in her traditions, grand in her assertion of the supremacy of Scripture, grand in the clearness with which she asserts, as against the corruptions of Rome, the faith once for all delivered to the saints; but I cannot say, for she herself forbids me to say, that she is the pattern for all Churches, and that unless their polity, their rites and ceremonies, are framed after her's they are no part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. But if this is the true view of the Church, then a consequence follows of the utmost importance. Then all those claims which we hear so constantly made on behalf of Catholic practice, and Catholic doctrine, and Catholic antiquity disappear utterly. If, as Hooker says, "The visible Church is one, continuing from the first beginning of the world unto the last end," then there is no one practice, rite, or ceremony that is common to the whole of that Church. Or if we limit our conception of the Church to its Christian form, as "the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world," then except the rite of baptism by water into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, there is absolutely no rite which in all particulars is of like observance throughout the Church. Beyond the doctrines of the Nicene Creed there are no Catholic doctrines. And the appeal to Catholic antiquity is futile; first, because there never has been a complete representation of the whole Church at any one time; next, because the Fathers in primitive times, differed as much on points of doctrine and even

of practice, as Christians have differed in later times; and lastly because the Church of Christ is a living body. If you are to appeal to the Catholic Church you must make your appeal to it not in one century, or in two, or in four, but in every century, and just as much now in this 19th century as in the second or the third.

To me it is amazing that men should put organization before life; that they should care more and fight more for unity of government than for unity of faith and love. "Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church." This is the Church which is truly Catholic; which, receiving all its life from its Divine and glorious Head, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord, and maketh increase unto the edifying of the body in love. This is that Church which is built upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone. This is the Church, not only of a Cyprian and an Augustine, of an Ambrose and a Chrysostom, of a Bernard and an Anselm, of a Thomas à Kempis, and a Fénélon and a Pascal,—not only of a Wicliffe and a Tyndale, of a Ridley and a Latimer, of a Richard Hooker and a Jeremy Taylor,—but the Church of a Calvin and a Luther, a Zuinglins, and a John Knox; the Church of a Richard Baxter and a John Bunyan, of a John Wesley and a Robert Hall and a Thomas Chalmers, and of a great multitude whom no man can number.

My Christian brethren,—This is no merely theoretical question. It must affect the whole of our life and our conduct towards Christians of other denominations. We shall stand aloof from them or we shall seek to draw nearer to them, according as we hold our Church's doctrine of what constitutes Christ's Holy Catholic Church, or take instead the modern theory which has been substituted for it. We stand face to face with terrible evils, with an untold amount of misery and sin. Infidelity is lifting her head boldly among us. Souls are perishing, uncared for, unknown. Large masses of our population are sunk in brutal indifference, and trampled down in the mire of intemperance and impurity. The Church of England, however great her sacrifices, however

heroic her efforts, however zealous and self-denying her ministers, has not been able to meet and stem these evils. Is she not strong enough, is she not generous enough, is she not noble enough, to welcome all, however they may differ from her in externals, to extend the right hand of fellowship to all who are labouring to spread Christ's Kingdom in the world, and to save the hapless victims of Satan's tyrrany from his cruel grasp? There is a littleness, there is a narrowness, there is a petty jealousy, quite unworthy of a great society, in the way in which some members of our Church stand on their dignity, and refuse to acknowledge those who, if they are mistaken, are at least doing Christ's work in the world, honouring Him, striving to bring souls to Him, though it may be not by our methods. And alas! among our brethren, who differ from us, differences are often exaggerated, and arrogance returned with defiance, and bitterness given back for scorn, and so the rent has been widened which forbearance and love and gentleness might have healed. There are some things surely in which we may recognize them as brethren. There is a common work in which we may engage without sacrifice of conviction. If, standing by the side of the river Nene, I were to see a poor creature struggling for his life in the water, and one passing by should come to the rescue, should I ask who he was and whence he came before I would accept his aid in drawing the drowning man to the bank? And souls are sinking in the dark waters of sin, and I must stop to ask those who would help me to rescue them, whether they can pronounce my Shibboleth before I will suffer them to join me in the holy work of bringing them to their Saviour.

Brethren, let the belief in Christ's Holy Catholic Church be a reality for us. Let us begin this New Year* with a larger, a more charitable, a truer belief than some of us have hitherto held. I do not say that all differences can be merged, I do not say that all are unimportant, I do not plead for the sacrifice of any principle which we conscientiously hold; but I do plead for a larger

* The Sermon was preached on the evening of Sunday, January 7, 1883.

charity and a more generous faith. The time is coming when all these differences which now hold us apart will disappear; when in the light of a Saviour's love we shall wonder that we ever allowed such strifes and jealousies to tear us asunder. That light will reveal to us a ground of union broader and deeper than all our differences. The Infinite Love will make us one in itself. Filled with that love, all who love Him will love one another in Him. All hearts will be united, all faith and all worship will be one; all will join in the same ascription of praise to Him who loved them and washed them from their sins in His own blood, and made them kings and priests unto the Father; and the Prayer of our Great High Priest shall find its perfect accomplishment, "that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected unto one."

THE MINISTRY.

EPHESIANS iv., 11, 12, 13.

"And He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ; till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."—*(Revised Version).*

The origin of the Christian ministry, the variety of functions which it is called upon to discharge, the end and purpose designed by it are all brought before us in this remarkable passage. First we are reminded that this ministry is in its origin Divine. St. Paul claims for it this excellency; he traces it to its source in the Risen and Ascended Lord. The great Head of the Church has bestowed upon her this gift as the fruit of His ascension. Having "ascended up far above all heavens," He gave to His Church those who were to rear and train and guide it, and bring it to perfection. If the society chooses and ordains its ministers, the office nevertheless in all its varied powers is of Divine appointment. It is not of man but of God. Next we observe how manifold the office is, and through what a variety of agents it is discharged. "Apostles" who were sent as their Lord was sent,

and to whom was entrusted the rule and government of the Church, "prophets" to whom is vouchsafed spiritual insight and glowing utterance, "evangelists" who are the bearers of the glad tidings, proclaiming the message in life as well as in word, "pastors" who feed and tend the flock, "teachers" whose lips keep knowledge,—all these have their place in the ministry, all these diverse in their natural endowments, and fitted accordingly for different parts of the great work, are alike employed in the Master's service, are alike His gift to the Church. Lastly, there is the end designed. This Divine appointment has respect to the necessities of the Church. The Church is not for the ministry but the ministry for the Church. This is the true order, though it has not unfrequently been reversed. All this apparatus, so large and so varied, has a purpose beyond itself. It is "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of ministering, for the building up of the body of Christ, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

It is of this ministry that I purpose to speak this evening. What is necessary to it, what are its essential characteristics in order to the accomplishment of the great work to which it is called? What is the office as it is brought before us in Holy Scripture? The office of the Christian minister as described in the New Testament is not one, but manifold. Sometimes he is spoken of as a shepherd, a figure found already in the Old Testament, and there applied to the Prophets who are the true representatives under the Jewish economy of the Christian ministry. So our Lord after His resurrection, giving His charge to Peter, bids him feed His lambs and tend His sheep. So Peter himself giving a charge to his fellow-elders, with those words graven on his memory gives it in like manner, "feed, tend, the flock of God which is among you," and reminds them that herein they share in Christ's own work and mission, and that "when the Chief Shepherd shall be manifested, they shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away." Or again, St. Paul employing another figure compares the Christian

minister to one who labours as a husbandman in the vineyard of God: "I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." Or again, to a master builder in rearing the great spiritual temple, recognizing at the same time fully that this is a work in which all co-operate, that the great society which groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord, and is built up of living stones, is not only reared by the minister of the Gospel, but is "builded together" by mutual labour "for an habitation of God in the spirit." Or again he writes, "Let a man so account of us, as of ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God"—stewards to bring forth out of the Master's treasure-house things new and old. Or again the Christian minister is an ambassador: "Now then we are ambassadors on behalf of Christ, as though God did intreat you by us, we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled unto God." Or, dropping all figure, the Christian minister is a preacher and teacher. There is no part of his office which in St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy is more insisted on than this of teaching. Of himself he says, speaking of the Gospel "whereunto I was appointed a preacher and an Apostle (I speak the truth, I lie not), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth." The bishop (or presbyter) must be "apt to teach." To Timothy he says, "Give heed to reading, to exhortation, to teaching." "These things command and teach." (iv. 11.) "Take heed to thyself and to thy teaching." (iv. 16.) "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His Kingdom, preach the word, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and teaching".... "Do the work of an Evangelist"—a publisher of the glad tidings of the Gospel—and so "fulfil thy ministry." Just as of himself and his own ministry he had said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel," as if all were comprised in that, so he lays it as a solemn injunction upon his son in the faith, "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and kingdom, preach the word." Not that he had ever forgotten the pastoral work in the Evangelistic. He laboured for and watched over his congregations with

a godly jealousy that he might present every man perfect in Christ. "Who," he asks, "is weak and I am not weak? Who is offended, and I burn not?" There was tender solicitude for each, there was warm sympathy with all. A bold and faithful preacher of the gospel, a wise and tender and affectionate shepherd of the flock, a steward who should bring out of his treasures things new and old,—this is St. Paul's conception of the ministerial office.

But now in all this enumeration of the various parts of the ministry, in the employment of all these various figures, there is one thing wanting which must surely strike us. The Jewish ministry was before the eyes of the Apostles. The temple was standing with its sacrifices and its priests. Paul and Peter were both Jews, and Peter was a bigoted Jew, and yet neither the one nor the other finds in the Jewish Levitical ministry the pattern of the Christian ministry. There is one thing absolutely excluded, not merely passed by or omitted, but deliberately excluded from the idea of the Christian ministry: whatever else it may be, it is not a priesthood. Surely nothing is more striking than the absolute opposition between the Old Testament and the New in this respect. The whole of the Old Testament, the whole of the law and the ministry under the law, may be described as a vast apparatus of priestly mediation. All access to God is through the priest. The priest offers the sacrifices which are to put away guilt, the priest makes atonement, the priest pronounces the leper clean, the priest intercedes, the priest absolves, the priest blesses. In the New Testament, all this has vanished. The ministry of a human priesthood disappears, because all Christians are priests in and through the One Eternal Priest who has put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; who by His own precious blood has entered in once for all into the most Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us; from whom the holy oil of consecration descends upon every believer; and through whom all have access without fear, entering with Him within the veil into the very presence of the Father.

The Christian minister is an ambassador of God, he is a steward of the mysteries of God, he is a builder of the temple of God,

and in that work a co-builder with God, he is a shepherd of the flock under the Chief Shepherd, he is an evangelist, a prophet, a pastor, a teacher, but he is not a priest. Not once in the whole of the New Testament is the name "priest" ever given to the Christian minister. In one only passage is there even a figurative use of a word implying priestly office. "That I should be a minister (λειτουργον) of Jesus Christ," writes St. Paul, "ministering (ἱερουργοῦντα) the gospel of God, that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."* But the language of the whole verse is clearly metaphorical, the figure being borrowed from Jewish rites, precisely in the same way as the Apostle adopts a sacrificial figure in the Epistle to the Philippians, when he writes (ii. 17), "Yea, and if I be offered (poured out as a libation) upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all." The Roman Christians are themselves the offering which he presents unto God, the faith of the Philippians is a sacrifice upon which he himself is poured out as a libation.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, which may be called the Divine interpretation of the Old Testament in the New, never once even suggests that the Jewish ministry finds its counterpart in the Christian. It tells us much of that ministry, it shows us how it was fulfilled in Christ, but it has only one allusion to Christian ministers, and then it speaks of them not as priests, but as those that have the rule and government of the Church, and as preachers of the word: "Remember them that had the rule over you and spake unto you the word of God." (xiii. 7). The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul, so full of directions respecting the Christian clergy, their office and their duties are wholly silent as to any priestly function. No hint is given as to its discharge, none that they have the right to exercise it. Throughout the New Testament it is the same. Ministers of religion among the Jews and among the heathen are called "priests" (ἱερεῖς); but the only way in which

* Rom. xv, 16. The margin of the Revised Version on the word "ministering" is, "Gr. *ministering in sacrifice.*"

the word is employed in a Christian sense is, first, as designating Christ the Great High Priest of our profession, Christ the fulfilment both in His Person and in His work of all that the Jewish system foretold, Christ at once the true atoning victim and the true sacrificing priest, who having accomplished once for all His atoning work, now ever liveth to make intercession for us; and next, as belonging in and through Him to all true Christians, who in the merit of His spotless and perfect sacrifice offer the spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving and alms and good deeds, present themselves, body, soul and spirit unto God, a reasonable holy and living sacrifice. But in this sense the title does not belong to the Christian minister as a minister, but only to the minister as a member of the congregation. Every layman *in this sense* is as truly a priest as the clergyman; every layman is as much bound to offer to God the spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving as the clergyman; every layman has the same privilege of prayer and intercession for others. In the spiritual sense of the word "priest," there is absolutely no difference whatever between the layman and the clergyman. Do not take my word for it. Search the New Testament from St. Matthew's Gospel to the Revelation, and find if you can a single passage in which the Christian minister is called a priest (ἱερεύς). You will find *all* Christians addressed by St. Peter the Bishop of the Church as "a royal priesthood." His letter is addressed, not to the clergy, but to all the dispersed Jewish Christians in the various localities which he mentions in the Superscription. To *all* he says: "Ye are a royal priesthood;.... ye are built up as living stones, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." But when he turns to address the clergy, you will observe that he describes them and himself with them as "elders" not as "priests": "The elders that are among you I exhort, who am also your co-elder, Tend the flock of God, taking the oversight thereof" (being overseers or bishops of it; for originally "elder" and "overseer" belonged to the same office), not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind." That name "elder" or the title "overseer" are the name and the

title invariably given to the higher order of the Christian ministry, when that ministry is described not by its spiritual characteristics, but by its external relation to the Church. But write it down in your memories—for it will save you from a world of confusion of thought, as well as from all the mischief of erroneous teaching,—that never once in the New Testament is the Christian minister called a "priest."

It will be said, however, much is true that is not in Scripture, and the Prayer Book calls the clergy "priests," and you therefore as a loyal son of the Church are bound to accept the title. When candidates are presented for ordination, those who are presented for the higher grade are said to be called to the order of Priesthood. Again, not only is the word "priest" used in several places in the Rubrics instead of "minister," but Absolution and the administration of the Lord's Supper are confined to the Priest. Hence we are told that Sacerdotalism is rooted in the Church of England Liturgy. This is a charge brought against us by some who dissent from us. This is maintained as a glory and an honour by some who minister among us. But what are the facts? We must not be misled by a word. The word "priest" is an ambiguous word, and has two totally different meanings. Etymologically it means one thing; as a matter of usage it most commonly means another. Etymologically it means "elder," or "presbyter"; it is merely "presbyter writ short." It comes to us of course from the Greek word πρεσβύτερος, which in its Latinized form passed into French, and in its passage was clipt and shortened into Priest. In our common speech no doubt we understand by it simply a minister of religion: we use it of a heathen priest or of a Jewish priest, as a person set apart to perform certain religious rites and ceremonies, and especially to offer sacrifices. But it is demonstrable that this is not the sense in which it is used in our Prayer Book. We are as Christian ministers that which we were set apart to be at our ordination. Now if you turn to the Preface to the Ordination Service you will find these words: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been

three orders of ministers, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." But the only order associated with Bishops and Deacons in the New Testament and in ancient authors is the order of Presbyters. It is therefore indisputable that our Church uses Priest as the equivalent of Presbyter in her Ordination Service, and if in her Ordination Service, then everywhere else; for we are that which we are ordained to be. This moreover is abundantly confirmed, if confirmation were needed, by the fact that in the solemn and beautiful and heart-searching Exhortation addressed to Priests (*i.e.* Elders) in our Ordination Service, they are not told that they are priests (which surely they must have been if the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice was; as is frequently maintained, the chief part of their office) but that they are "messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord"; and in the prayer that follows, the ministry instituted by Christ is said to consist of apostles, prophets, evangelists, doctors and pastors—not of priests; the Church here giving the same enumeration as St. Paul gives in the text.

Deeply do I think it to be lamented that the ambiguous word was ever suffered to take the place of the word which could not be misunderstood. Deeply do I regret that when the Church so carefully excluded the word "altar" from the Prayer Book, she did not also exclude the word "priest" as being capable of a wrong and un-christian meaning. The force of words is great, the corruption of words carries with it wide consequences. If these two words had never been used, except in their merely figurative and spiritual sense as applying to our Lord and to the whole body of believers, the history of the Church would have been different; some of the worst errors would never have blotted its pages. How the whole of the false analogy between the Jewish priesthood and the Christian ministry disappears. High Priest, priests, levites,—how absolutely certain it is that these are not the types or predecessors of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. How plain it is that the Christian ministry is constructed on the model of the Synagogue with its elders and its simple service, not on the model of the Temple with its sacrificing

priests and its gorgeous ritual. How plain it is that common prayer and the preaching of God's word, not a mediating priesthood is the central idea of the Church's worship. What a vast pile of priestly assumption shrivels and collapses in a moment, when we go to the New Testament and not to the Fathers, or to the Church of Rome to learn what the true nature of the ministry is.

But it may be said, the name is of little importance, provided it can be gathered from the description of the Christian ministry and its power as exercised in the New Testament that the thing meant, viz., the priestly character, belongs to it. If we can find priestly power given to or assumed by the Apostles, or priestly acts done by them, or by others whom they appointed to minister in the Church, then no doubt the argument built upon the absence of the name is considerably weakened. And this is what is maintained. When we ask for any proof that this priestly character has been bestowed on the Christian minister, we are always referred to two passages in St. Matthew's Gospel and one in St. John's, as furnishing evidence that the power was conveyed. In the first of these (Matt. xvi. 19) our Lord says to St. Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven." In the second (Matt. xviii. 18) He confers the same authority on all the Apostles, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven." The power here conveyed, it is assumed, is the power of absolving penitent offenders, and of excluding the impenitent from the Church; and this power it is further alleged belongs first to the Apostles, and then through them to their lawful successors. But how groundless is the assumption. In the first place, the power of the keys and the power of binding and loosing are quite distinct; and in the next, they have nothing whatever to do with absolution. The "key" in Scripture is used either as the symbol of authority or as the symbol of instruction. When it is said of Eliakim, "the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open and none shall shut;

and he shall shut and none shall open," (Isaiah xxii. 22), it is plain from the context, "and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem," (ver. 21), and "he shall be a glorious throne to his Father's house," (ver. 23), that the key laid upon his shoulder is the symbol of rule. The same may be said of the language of the great Apocalyptic vision, where He who is the First and the Last declares that He has "the keys of hell and of death," (Rev. i. 18); and who as the true Lord and King of the house of David "opened and none could shut, and shut and none could open" (Rev. iii. 7). The other sense in which the symbol of the key occurs is as the key of knowledge. When the scribe was admitted to his office as an interpreter of the Law, a key was put into his hand as denoting that he had authority to unlock its treasures and to dispense them for the benefit of others. Hence, when our Lord charged the scribes with being unfaithful to their trust, He charged them with taking away "the key of knowledge." The power of rule, then, and the power of teaching were consigned to Peter, when the keys of the kingdom were put into his hand.

The power to bind and to loose was distinct from the power of the keys, but like that it belonged to the scribe's office. It was not a priestly function; it was legislative and interpretative, not judicial; it concerned itself with things, not with persons. The phrase occurs hundreds of times in Jewish literature, and always with the same meaning. "To bind" is to forbid a certain practice; "to loose" is to allow it. Thus, for instance, the school of Shammai "bound," when it declared a particular act unlawful as a transgression of the Sabbath; the school of Hillel "loosed," when it allowed what the other had forbidden.

Further, it is to be observed that the authority given in the first instance to Peter is subsequently extended to the whole Christian society (Matt. xviii. 18). Matters in dispute are to be brought before the Church or congregation (ver. 17) when they cannot be privately composed, and the Church is to lay down the principles by which the contending parties are to be guided. The decision as to what is lawful or unlawful is thus transferred to the whole congregation.

There remains one passage which is sometimes relied upon as conclusive of the point at issue, the well-known passage in St. John's Gospel, which is put into the mouth of the Bishop by our own Church in the Ordination of Presbyters: "Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosesoever sins ye retain they are retained." There it is said at least one priestly power is conferred, the power of absolution. This power was conferred originally on the Apostles; this power is transmitted from them by direct succession to all lawfully appointed ministers. But here we have only one of a thousand instances of a hasty and superficial interpretation, caught up and repeated till they have been accepted without examination. A little examination overthrows the whole superstructure. The words were not addressed to all the Apostles, for Thomas was absent; nor were they addressed to the Apostles alone, for St. Luke tells us that others were assembled with the eleven (Luke xxiv. 23). Whatever therefore the power here bestowed, it was bestowed on the Christian society, and not on the Christian ministry. "The words are the charter of the Christian Church, and not simply the charter of the Christian ministry."* In the next place it was bestowed once for all. There is no provision made for its transmission along a particular line: "conferred on the community and never revoked, it continues as long as the community continues." It is the power of a new creation. "He breathed on them" now, as at the first God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life. The creation of the Church answers to the creation of man. All the power of that spiritual life in all its various manifestations, all its influence upon a world dead in trespasses and sins comes from Him who in that upper chamber breathed on His Church after His resurrection from the dead. "With that breath He gave them," it has been beautifully said, "His soul also and His spirit, His mind and heart, His life and love, His inmost self, His all. He thereby confirmed and established the true view concerning His Divine humanity, that it was not merely the pilgrim cloak in

* Westcott, *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, p. 82.

which He walked upon earth, not the flesh only in which He suffered, but that now also in His resurrection, and still more in His exaltation, it is so pervaded by His quickening Spirit that it will for ever remain our access unto God and the means whereby God's grace is imparted unto us."*

Not one of these passages, then, when rightly interpreted, favours the priestly system. Not one of them records either the original bestowal, or the continued transmission of priestly powers. Sacerdotalism is not to be found in the New Testament.

My brethren, this is not a mere matter of words and names. Our whole conception of the Church and the ministry and its relation to the Church turns upon the view we hold. For myself, I look with sorrow and alarm upon the progress of sacerdotalism in the Church. I say not one word against individuals. There may be much that is zealous and self-denying and holy in men who maintain the priestly system. But that it is as a system antagonistic to Christ and subversive of the Gospel I am fully persuaded. I believe that Thomas Arnold of Rugby was right, when more than 40 years ago he wrote : " The difference between a Christian and a Christian minister is but one of office, not of moral or spiritual advancement, not of greater or less nearness to God. One is our Master even Christ, and all we are brethren :— words which certainly do not imply that all members of the Church are to have the same office, or that all offices are of equal importance and dignity, but which do imply most certainly that any attempt to convert the ministry into a priesthood, that is to represent them as standing in any measure as mediators between Christ and His people, or as being essentially the channels through which His grace must pass to His Church is directly in opposition to Him, and is no better than idolatry."† I believe he was right when he insisted that " to revive Christ's Church is to expel the antichrist of priesthood, which, as it was foretold of him, 'as

* Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus.* I have discussed this passage of St. John at length in the Appendix to my Sermon, " Confession in the Church of England," Macmillan & Co., 1877.

† Sermons ; *The Christian Life, its course, &c.*, p. 424.

God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God,' and to restore its disfranchised members, the laity, to the discharge of their proper duties in it, and to the consciousness of their paramount importance.'"*

Let it not be said that this is to lower the dignity of the Christian ministry, and to rob it of its most sacred and awful prerogatives. On the contrary, to invest it with the priestly character is to degrade and to destroy it. I wish to set before you and to place in the clearest light its true glory and excellency. I desire to assert plainly and emphatically unto how high a dignity and how weighty an office I am called. But I am quite sure I shall do this exactly in proportion as I keep to that view of the Christian ministry, which is the only view in which Holy Scripture presents it. We are not teachers of a philosophy, or hired advocates of a system, or members of a priesthood. We are ambassadors of the King of kings; we have his credentials, we receive our authority and our message from Him; we go in His Name, we go on the behalf of Christ, to plead with men as He pleaded; we are sent as He was sent; He is with us for the fulfilment of our commission, that men may turn through His word spoken by us from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

Can there be a loftier conception of our office than this? Let us see to it that we never take a lower view of our ministry. When I stand by the font to receive a little child into the family of God, let me say to myself, I am here as an ambassador on behalf of Christ to declare His love to His little ones; I am sent to bring them to Him that He may take them in His arms and bless them.

When I administer the Holy Supper of His love, I proclaim to all who draw near to His Holy Table the blessed truth that He died to put away sin, that His body broken and His blood shed are our redemption, that all who by faith partake thereof are "very members incorporate in His mystical body," saved by His

* Sermons; *The Christian Life, its course, &c.*, Introduction, p. lii.

death, sanctified by His Spirit, heirs of His glory. I am preaching Him, not myself; I am inviting the weary and the heavy laden to come to Him, not to me; I am not offering Him afresh, or re-presenting His sacrifice, or intruding into His office; but I am bidding the sinner look to Him the One only Eternal Priest for pardon and for life.

When I preach, I preach the Gospel, and woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel. But the Gospel is the glad tidings of a Father's love, the message of reconciliation from the King of heaven, the assurance that to Him who believeth in Jesus there is no condemnation, but that he is passed from death unto life. It is the proclamation of a free forgiveness, of a present salvation by the soul's immediate contact with Christ; it is living union with Him; it is Christ in us by the Holy Ghost. Yes, in the pulpit I preach His word, not my own; I speak for Him; I speak *on the behalf of Christ;* I entreat, I persuade, I exhort, I say *on the behalf of Christ,* "Be ye reconciled unto God." I am not the accredited messenger of a party, of a system, of a Church, I am the ambassador of God.

When I stand by the bed of the sick and dying, and feel how solemn in those last hours of an ebbing life is the responsibility of my office, let this thought be my strength, I am the servant and the witness of Him, who, when He was on earth not only banished disease by His word and gave life to the dead, but who turned earthly suffering into a channel of His saving grace, and who gave to the robber on the cross a place at His side in His kingdom. By my mouth He speaks still. The words of pardon are His; He is exalted to give repentance and remission of sins; He ever liveth to make intercession; He will give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him. Why need I fear? In my weakness His strength is magnified. Let me sink myself, let me forget myself, let me lose myself in Him.

Let me watch as against the most deadly of all temptations, against the temptation to exalt myself, to thrust myself between any soul of man and Christ, whether that temptation come to me under the guise of a specious sacerdotalism, or whether it come to

me under the not less dangerous allurement to be a popular preacher, or, it may be, even a party leader. Let me preach Christ, live Christ, determine as St. Paul did to know nothing else, Christ in His Eternal Power and Godhead, Christ in His human sympathy and love, Christ in His atoning sacrifice, Christ in His risen glory, Christ in His interceding heavenly life, Christ on His mediation, Christ the Prophet, Christ the Priest, Christ the King. This was what the great Apostle did. Wherever he went, to commercial Corinth with its dissolute manners, its wealth, its traffic, its luxury; or to polished Athens with its culture, its philosophy, its splendid literature, its unrivaled art; or to rugged Galatia with its rough half-civilized impetuous fickle population; or to Rome, the mistress of the world, with her great civil and military organization, the centre of the world's power and the fountain of the world's law,—however varied the intellectual and social condition of those whom he addressed, still everywhere he carries the same message, everywhere he preaches, not himself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. Before that Gospel all distinctions of men and of rank vanish. To the slave and to the free, to the gladiator from the banks of the Danube, "butchered to make a Roman holiday," and to his cruel masters; to the subtle and contemptuous Greek, and to the haughty Roman senator; to the Phœnician trader, to the sailor in whose ship he made his voyages, to the soldier who kept him, to the wealthy and refined matron, to the miserable harlot of the street, he is the bearer of the same tidings. He is made all things to all men if by any means he might gain some. He adapts himself to all prejudices, consults all feelings, never stands on his rights, puts forth no arrogant claims, is apt to teach, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; but his Gospel is always the same. It can never be altered, it can never be pared down, it can never be mutilated to suit the temper and fashion of the age, or the caprices and prejudices of the society to which it is delivered. That Gospel is the same, ever new indeed in its living force and variety of application to all needs and circumstances of men, but in its essential features unchangeable.

It is the Gospel of the Father who loves men, of the Son who died for them, of the Spirit who converts, renews, sanctifies them.

Let us see to it, that we preach it as St. Paul did. Let us never mutilate it, never lower it, never deal with it in the spirit of the huckster, or in the arrogant spirit of the priest; but as of sincerity, but as of truth, in the sight of God let us speak in Christ, as ambassadors on His behalf; and let this be our message, rich, full, varied in its application as it is free in its announcement, to wit, that God was reconciling the world in Christ unto Himself. "Now then, as ambassadors on behalf of Christ, we beseech you be ye reconciled unto God; for He made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."

BAPTISM.

Acts ii., 38.

"Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins."

This was the first Christian baptism on the first great Whitsunday. It was the fulfilment of His own command after He was risen from the dead: "Go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." He had promised that His apostles should be endued with power from on high to fit them for their work; He had shed forth, in accordance with that promise, the gift of the Holy Ghost; and in the power of the Holy Ghost Peter had preached his first sermon on the great Whitsunday, and his word was with such power that the hearts of those who heard were touched and softened and quickened from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness: and then, when thus moved they asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered in the words of the text, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost. For to you is the promise and

unto your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him." The result was, we are told, that they that received his word were baptized, and there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls. And the very words of this first baptism have been perpetuated in that article of our Creed in which we declare our belief in "one baptism for (or unto) the remission of sins."

Now we observe of the first baptism several particulars. Repentance was required as necessary to it: "Repent and be baptized." It admitted into a state of pardon, it was for the remission of sins. By it was to be received the Holy Ghost. There was a covenant of promise attached to it—"the promise is unto you and to your children," &c. It was the solemn act of incorporation into the Christian fellowship; for all these were added to the Church, and "continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers."

As we follow the history of the Acts we find faith made the condition of baptism. Thus we are told of the Samaritans that when they believed they were baptized, and if the Received Text be correct, Philip made faith a condition of baptism in the case of the eunuch: "if thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." Saul was already converted when Ananias went to him and bid him be baptized and wash away his sins. Cornelius and they that were with him had received the Holy Ghost at the preaching of Peter before they were baptized, and it is the very ground on which Peter urges their claim to baptism: "Can any man forbid the water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" But we need not dwell on the fact that, whatever the blessing of baptism may be, a spiritual change is required in the case of adults in order to baptism. Just as in the case of Abraham circumcision was the seal of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised; so baptism is the seal, the effectual sign of the repentance and faith with which the Christian catechumens came to baptism. This is the universal requirement of the Church. All Christian missionaries to this day look for some evidence of repentance and faith before baptism is ad-

ministered. And yet baptism has a meaning and a significance and a virtue of its own. St. Paul declares, "as many of us as were baptized were baptized into Christ's death" (Rom. vi. 3). He tells the Colossians that they "were buried with Christ in baptism, wherein they were also raised through faith in the working of God who raised Him from the dead." To the Corinthians he says, "we were baptized into one body," even the Church which is the body of Christ. And once more, St. Peter comparing the ark of Noah to the Church, compares the water of the flood on which the ark was carried safely, when the impenitent world was drowned, to baptism, which he says as the true likeness (or the antitype) now saves us; not indeed by the mere external rite, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation (or appeal) of a good conscience towards God through the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Now it must be remembered, that in all these passages baptism is regarded primarily in its relation to the admission of adults into the Church. No doubt children were admitted from the earliest times. But St. Paul and St. Peter are not writing to children. They are addressing those the great bulk of whom, whether Jews or Gentiles, embraced Christianity in mature life. These are reminded of all that their baptism signified to them. It was a beautiful and expressive symbol of a cleansing from past defilement and the entering upon a new life. They who went down into the water were, so to speak, buried therein. It meant a death and burial with Christ, a death to sin; and the coming up out of the water meant a resurrection with Him and a life exalted like His, above the noise and turmoil of the earth, into the very sanctuary above. Hence the force of the appeal made by St. Paul to the Colossians: If ye then were raised with Christ in your baptism; if it was a reality, not merely a symbol, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God; set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth.*

* The early Church typified this change by the "chrisom" or white garment; and early Church writers delighted to find images of purity and brightness, expressive of the change and the new life; and they called the baptized "stars rising from the water" and "gleaming lilies of the font." On the coin of Constantine the Great, stamped in memory of his baptism, was engraven on one side a pool of water with a lily growing out of it.

The language of the Church of England in her Articles is exactly in accordance with, might be described as a summary of, all these passages of Scripture. She says, "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby as by an instrument they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church, (so St. Paul says, 'ye are baptized into one body,') the promises of forgiveness of sins and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increased [not therefore first given] by virtue of prayer unto God." If all this applied only to adult baptism there would be no doubt and no difference of opinion; but the Article adds, "the baptism of young children is in anywise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." Here arises the whole difficulty. First there are those, outside our own Church, who deny altogether that infants should be baptized. And next there is in our own Church the widest divergence of opinion as to what are the effects of baptism in the case of infants.

Let me touch briefly on both these points. First, then, the Church tells us that the baptism of infants is to be retained as most agreeable with the institution of Christ. I pray you to observe the extreme moderation of this language. It contrasts favourably with the vehement and unchristian tone which has sometimes been adopted in the controversy. I will not quote the words used by a celebrated Baptist preacher on this subject some years ago, because I hope and believe he would not use them now. I do not mean that his convictions are less strong, but I trust he would express himself with less vehemence and uncharitableness. But I want you to observe how studiously moderate is the tone of the Church of England. She does not assert that infant baptism is clearly and indisputably taught in the Holy Scriptures. She says it is most agreeable with the institution of Christ. And is not this exactly the truth? When our Lord said to His disciples, "Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations, bap-

tizing them into the triple Name," He was addressing Jews. What had been the Jewish practice and belief? What was the symbolic rite of admission into the Jewish Church? Circumcision. How was that administered? To all Jewish male children. But besides this, baptism was administered by the Jews to all proselytes from among the heathen, and the children of proselytes were baptized as well as their parents. Hence the whole current of Jewish belief and Jewish practice was in favour of the admission of infants into the Church. Add to this that the disciples themselves had witnessed the tender love of Jesus for children. They had heard His gracious invitation, "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." They had seen His significant gesture, when He took them up in His arms, laid His hands upon them, and blessed them. Could they for one moment have questioned whether children were to be admitted into the Christian covenant? If under the Law they were not excluded, they could not be excluded under the Gospel. If that strait and narrow economy were large enough for them, how should the new covenant with all its richness and fulness of blessing be shut primarily against those towards whom Christ had manifested in such a striking manner His love? And would it not have been necessary for our Lord, speaking to Jews—accustomed to the circumcision of their own children, accustomed to the baptism of the children of proselytes—would it not have been necessary for Him to have said to them in express terms, "Do not baptize infants, baptize only adults," if He had intended to lay this prohibition upon them? Here, unquestionably, not to prohibit was to allow. The command could only have been understood in one way, and we have the almost unbroken testimony of antiquity that it was so understood. Infant baptism was the rule in the Church.

I could say much more in defence of the practice did time permit, but this is not my object to-night. Most of those who hear me have probably no difficulty on this point; they love to dedicate their children from the earliest dawn of their being to the Father who loves them and the Saviour who died for them.

I turn now to the other and more difficult question, the nature of the grace conferred in baptism. A little more than thirty years ago the Church of England was convulsed on this subject of baptism. Many of us can remember what a storm was evoked by the Gorham controversy, and how the decision of the Privy Council threatened to shake the very foundations of the Church. A large body of the clergy, and amongst them some very influential and learned men, insisted that the faith was in peril; they loudly repudiated the Judgement, and passionately asserted that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration had been denied and set aside by lawyers who knew nothing of theology, and had no right therefore to say what the doctrine of the Church on this question was. And, although the whole question as to the truth of the doctrine has almost faded out of view, so completely has the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper now, in the thoughts of these very same persons, superseded the Sacrament of baptism, yet one result, and a very important result, has remained. The decision in that case has been appealed to again and again, and is always appealed to, as a sufficient reason if no other existed for reforming our Ecclesiastical Courts. It is said over and over again, with the persistency of a fixed idea, that the effect of the Gorham Judgement was to deny a main Article of the Creed of the Church of England, and thus to commit the Church, if she did not formally repudiate the Judgement, to the sanction of erroneous doctrine, and so to divest her of her character as a true and orthodox branch of the Catholic Church. And yet nothing can be further from the truth. Any one who reads that Judgement with unprejudiced eyes must see, how carefully the eminent persons who delivered it lay it down that they are not stating what is or what is not the doctrine of the Church of England on the question before them. All that they had to consider was, whether Mr. Gorham's language on the subject of baptism was or was not at variance with the acknowledged formularies of the Church of England. Unless it was so, clearly and unequivocally, they did not think he was to be condemned and thereby disqualified for institution to the living to which he had been presented. I do not believe that the doctrine

of the Church of England has been in any way touched by the Judgement. I believe it remains exactly what it was before. All that has been done is to give a larger liberty of interpretation to our formularies, and for this I for one am thankful. I have no wish to see the Church of England narrowed down to the dimensions of a sect. I believe her safety and her glory to be in her possibilities of comprehension. There are, I know, limits to toleration. It is possible to ask too much, and to ask it only in one direction ; it is possible to say, as some are saying now, "We claim the liberty to hold all Romish doctrine and to introduce all Romish practice into the Church of England under the specious pretext that it is not Romish but Catholic." Thus every clergyman determines for himself what is Catholic, often being profoundly ignorant of history and of theology, and then introduces it into his parish and his church, in defiance of law, and even of the express language of the Prayer Book.

The Church of England has defined her own limits. Romewards her aspect is one of un-compromising hostility, and on no point more conspicuously than as regards the Sacraments. It may then conduce to clearness in our discussion of the subject, if I direct your attention first of all to the Romish doctrine of Baptism as laid down by the Council of Trent; for its wide divergence from the teaching of our own Church will be apparent. And next, I will comment briefly on the three principal views respecting baptismal grace which have been held by divines of the Church of England.

Now, first of all, what is the doctrine of the Church of Rome ? It is laid down very explicitly by the Council of Trent.

(Canon 6). "If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the "new law do not contain the grace which they signify, or do not "confer the grace itself on those not placing a bar, let him be "Anathema."

"If any one say that the sin of Adam . . . . is taken away, "either by the power of human nature, or by any other remedy "than the merit of the one Mediator, one Lord Jesus Christ; or "denies that the merit of Jesus Christ, duly conferred by the

"Sacrament of baptism in the Church is applied to adults as "well as to children, let him be Anathema." (Sess. v. 4).

"If any one deny that the imputation of original sin is re- "mitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ which is conferred "in baptism, or even asserts that the whole of that which has the "true and proper character of sin is not taken away, but only not "imputed, let him be Anathema." (Sess. v. 5).

"If any one say grace is not given by Sacraments of this "kind, always and to all, so far as God's part is concerned, but "only at times and to some, although they be duly received, let "him be Anathema."

"If any one say that by the Sacraments of the new covenant "themselves grace is not conferred by the efficiency of the rite "*(ex opere operato)*, but that faith in the divine promise alone is "sufficient for obtaining grace, let him be Anathema."

"If any one say that in three Sacraments, *i.e.*, in baptism, con- "firmation, and orders, a character is not impressed upon the soul, "*i.e.*, a certain spiritual and indelible mark (for which reason they "cannot be repeated), let him be Anathema."

"By baptism, putting on Christ, we are made a new creature in "Him, obtaining plenary and entire remission of sins."

There can be no question as to the meaning of the Church of Rome. She speaks with no uncertain voice. She asserts clearly and unmistakeably that grace is contained in the Sacrament; the benefits of baptism are conveyed to all who are duly baptized; the merit of Jesus Christ is applied to all, sin is remitted, and all that has the true and proper nature of sin is taken away. A new character is imparted to the soul; it becomes the subject of a new creation, it obtains full and entire remission of all sins, and all this follows always and to all persons on the due administration of the Sacrament.

Now all this has been done with the intention of exalting the Sacrament by investing the outward rite with a special importance. But it is materialism of the grossest kind. Grace is made a thing, a substance which can reside in matter. It is held in the water, and the water conveys it to the soul. The soul's own action has

no part in this matter. So long as it puts no bar, and in the case of baptized infants it is assumed they can put no bar, no sooner is the body brought into contact with the water than the grace of the water passes into the soul. There it resides and dwells a potent germ and seed of life, hereafter to be developed and cherished, till it attain to perfection. Hence the erroneous importance attached by the Church of Rome to baptism as the beginning of the spiritual life. "The faithful are to be taught that unless they be regenerated unto God through the grace of baptism, whether their parents be Christian or Infidel, they are born to eternal misery and perdition." No other means of salvation remain for infants except baptism. And the Church of Rome, it must be admitted, is thoroughly consistent in her doctrine and her practice. Attaching all this importance to baptism, she allows all from among the laity, men or women, even Jews, Infidels, and Heretics, in case of necessity, to baptize. Her Missionaries abroad will stoop to any subterfuge in order to administer the rite to the children of heathen parents. A few years ago I recollect seeing a report sent home by the Jesuit Missionaries in China to the College of the Propaganda in Rome, in which they boasted of the artifices they employed to baptize Chinese infants. Admitted by Chinese parents into their houses, not as priests but as physicians, they took the opportunity when they prescribed for the mother or the child, to sprinkle a few drops of water on the child's head, and to repeat the baptismal formula; and they say it is impossible to calculate how many millions of young Chinese, dying before they commit actual sin, go to heaven every year. And then there follows the horrible conclusion that infants dying unbaptized, even though it be through no fault of their parents, as certainly it is no fault of their own, cannot enter into heaven. And the most that is said by way of consolation is, that it is not certain that they endure the penalty of fire, but that it is certain that their penalty will be the lightest of all. And this horrible doctrine, not indeed in its extreme ghastliness but in a modified form, has been adopted by many of our Church of England clergy. And we are told that these poor innocents must have no words of

hope uttered over them on their death ; they must be put in the earth with a mutilated service, and, though they may escape the fire of hell, they can never attain to the fulness of light and blessing which are at God's right hand for ever.

Now, I hope and believe that this doctrine, in all its gross materialism and its utter perversion of all that is truly spiritual in the Sacrament, is not held by many in the Church of England, though, a doctrine is not uncommonly held which has a very close resemblance to it. The doctrine is held that in the case of all infants, as they can put no bar to the Sacrament, there is infused at the very moment, when the words of the baptismal formula are uttered, the germ of a new life into the soul. The grace we are told is a covenanted grace. God for His part will surely give what He has promised to give : unbelief and impenitence alone prevent the operation of His grace. An impenitent adult therefore may refuse the grace offered through this Sacrament, but an infant cannot thus resist God, and consequently does receive the grace which God has pledged Himself by covenant to bestow. The guilt of original sin is put away, the germ of a new life is imparted, the infant is born again by the Spirit of God, and it depends upon itself and upon the subsequent training whether it retains and developes this spiritual life or not.

Persons who hold this view appeal to the language of the Catechism and of the Baptismal Service : "Seeing now that this child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits." "We yield Thee humble thanks most merciful Father that it hath pleased Thee to regenerate this infant with Thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for Thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into Thy Holy Church." "In my baptism I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Baptism signifies "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, for, being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace."

And yet it is to be observed that, strong as these passages are, there is not one of them which speaks of an infusion of grace or

an implanting of the germ of a spiritual life. Regeneration is mentioned as going along with baptism, but no definition of Regeneration is given.

The second view is that which is commonly called the Hypothetical view, or the charitable view. Persons who maintain this view say that all the services of the Church are framed on the assumption that those who use them are true believers. She can make no other assumption; she cannot frame services which shall be equally suitable in the mouth of the true believer and of the unbeliever. She puts the words of repentance and faith on the lips of all her children, just as St. Paul called the whole Church of Corinth holy and elect of God, though there were persons of scandalously immoral life in the midst of it: just as he said of all who were baptized into Christ that they had "put on Christ," so the Church charitably assumes that all infants are received of God, that those who bring the child to the font are true believers, that they offer true prayers, and that God hears and answers their prayers. In both her Sacraments she requires faith and repentance as necessary to any beneficial receiving of the Sacraments. Infants cannot have faith and repentance, but they promise them both by their sureties. And if we see the evidences of faith and repentance in after life, then we may be sure that the grace was given in the Sacrament, and then the Sacrament is spiritually complete. "Not until evidence of a regenerate life is given, not until signs of a converted soul are shown, is it right to speak of being God's child, except in the judgement of charity."

I admit that this opinion is perfectly consistent with loyal Churchmanship. It is not an undue straining of the language of the Prayer Book. We *must* use the language of charity with regard to the burial of the dead; why not use it in reference to the baptism of infants? In fact, it may claim the high authority of Hooker: "We speak of infants," he says, "as the law of charity alloweth both to think and speak." But I cannot disguise from myself that this view may have pernicious results in the matter of education.

Between these is yet another view according to which baptism

brings with it a change of state and not a change of nature. This view admits fully, accepts without reserve, all that our Saviour says, but it does not understand by regeneration a spiritual renewal. It understands by it, not a state of pardon and of actual goodness, but a state of pardon and a new capacity for goodness or an assisting grace (Mozley). Among our Church of England divines, Waterland has most clearly and satisfactorily explained this view. He says, "Regeneration is but another word for the new birth of a Christian ..... This is a spiritual change wrought upon any person by the Holy Spirit in the use of baptism, whereby he is translated from his natural state in Adam to a spiritual state in Christ. This change, translation, or adoption carries with it many Christian blessings and privileges, but all reducible to two; viz.: remission of sins (absolute or conditional), and a covenant claim for the time being to eternal happiness ..... Regeneration complete stands on two things that are, as it were, its two integral parts—the grant made over to the person and the reception of the grant. The grant once made continues always the same, but the reception may vary, because it depends upon the condition of the recipient. Renovation, I understand, is a renewal of heart and mind. Indeed regeneration is itself a kind of renewal, but then it is of the spiritual state considered at large; whereas, renovation seems to mean a more particular kind of renewal, namely, of the inward frame or disposition of the man. Renovation may be and should be with respect to adults, before, in, and after baptism."

Waterland afterwards takes the cases of adults and infants: "With regard to adults, there can be no salutary regeneration without renovation accompanying it, or, until in after years renovation is wrought in the soul." With regard to infants, he says, "They need no repentance and cannot have faith, but they are consecrated in solemn form to God; pardon, mercy, and other covenanted privileges are made over to them, and the Holy Spirit translates them out of their state of nature, to which a curse belongs, into a state of grace, favour, and blessing; this is their regeneration." That which the Church insists upon is that it is an adoption into the family of God, and a grafting into the body

of Christ, a title to the inheritance of the kingdom of Heaven. "This is a state of salvation, the state of those who should be saved, who will be saved if they fulfil the conditions on which their salvation depends. The gift of the Holy Ghost is assured to every baptized child. This gift we may believe to be really made and yet need not adopt the theory of an infused virtue, or a mysterious earnest of the Holy Spirit, or an implanted germ of life. This theory proceeds upon the arbitrary assumption that the gift cannot be really imparted unless it takes immediate effect. "Why should we not rather say that there is a real and present gift of the Holy Ghost, not in some scanty measure, but in all His fulness, yet according to the capacity of the recipient, and therefore in this case not immediately available, but to be dispensed hereafter according to God's good pleasure under the conditions of the baptismal covenant? And then it is simply equivalent to a state of grace and salvation."* If this view be correct, we may distinguish as Waterland does between regeneration and renovation. And there is scriptural warrant for regarding regeneration in this sense of incorporation into the family of God. In the 87th Psalm, the admission of the heathen nations into the Jewish family of God is spoken of as a new birth: "This man was born there."

This is the view which I myself accept. I believe that by baptism we are brought into the family of God, and so into covenant with Him. In this sense we are hereby made His children. We promise that as His children we will renounce the devil and all his works, and keep God's holy will and commandments. We promise repentance, faith, and obedience. He promises to all who are in His Son Jesus Christ forgiveness of sins, strength to overcome temptation, the enlightening, quickening, purifying grace of the Holy Spirit; all that we need in this life and the blessed hope of everlasting glory hereafter.

I conclude with two practical observations. First of all, what a help it ought to be to all Christian parents in the training of their children, that they have given them to God in their baptism. As they gather their children around them for the morning

* Bp. Thirlwall *Charges*, vol. i., p. 162.

or evening prayer, or for the instruction in God's Holy Word; as they teach them to fold their infant hands and to kneel by their side and to lisp forth their infant prayers, is there no help and strength and comfort in the thought, that as those children have been redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, so He Himself has gathered them into the fold of His Church, that their baptism is a witness to them of His love? Is it nothing to know and believe as we pray for them, that God's covenant and promise made with them in their baptism is one that He for His part will surely keep and perform? Is it nothing to remember that as Jesus took the little children in His arms when he was upon earth and said, "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven?" so He loves them still; so He stands by the font to receive them still. Is it nothing to know and to believe, as we watch the unfolding of their characters, and often perhaps have to mourn the visible deterioration of these characters, that nevertheless they carry on their brows the sign and seal of the Sacrament of their redemption? Is it nothing, as we look forward to the temptations which we know must come, and the trials and the sorrows which shall be their lot—and from which we would shield them, oh how gladly, and how thankfully if we could,—that the cross put upon their brow in their baptism is the sure token that He who then pledged them to be His faithful soldiers and servants unto their lives' end, will fulfil His own promise and put His strength into them, and nerve them for that holy war, if they do not as recusants and apostates turn away? Is it nothing, as day by day we commend those dear ones to the fatherly love of our God, and the tender care of the good Shepherd, and the grace and help of the Holy Spirit, to feel sure that what He has promised He will also perform? Surely, brethren, there is strength in the covenant which He has made with us in Christ Jesus, and in the sign and witness of the covenant which the water of baptism furnishes. We know that the world is a redeemed world, we know that God is a father, we know that He claims us all as His children in Jesus Christ, we know that He will give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him.

And once more, is there no strength for ourselves in that holy covenant: my baptism "wherein I was made, a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven?" You are the child of pious parents, who brought you to Christ in your infancy, and who trained you in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. While you were young, you gave heed to their instructions, you never omitted prayer and the reading of the Scriptures, you had some drawings of the heart towards God; His merciful Spirit hovered over you, and pleaded with your wayward will, and you yielded to His gracious voice. But you went forth into the world, and the tempter met you on your way, and offered you the pleasures of sin as his wages, and you listened to his voice. You forgot the covenant of your God, you forgot the pleasures which were at God's right hand, and you walked in the ways of your heart and in the sight of your eyes. You went away from your Father's house into the far country, and you wasted your all in riotous living; and then there came the terrible hunger of an immortal spirit, with nothing but the husks of its swinish pleasures to satisfy its cravings. Oh, then was it nothing to *know* that you had a Father and a home; nothing to know that your Father was waiting with outstretched arms to welcome you back? Was it no help, no encouragement, to remember that the dear ones—now perhaps gone to their rest—had brought you to God, in your baptism, as your Father, and had dedicated your infancy to Him, and had prayed for you that you might be His for ever? Oh, as the thought comes upon you—it may be with overwhelming bitterness—of what you might have been, and of all you have lost, is there no help, no encouragement in those words: "Which He for His part will surely keep and perform." Let this arouse you from your despair. Arise, and go to your Father, and say to Him, "I have sinned against heaven and am no more worthy to be called Thy child," and He will welcome you as His child, and put the ring of love on your hand and the shoes of peace on your feet, and give you a place in His house; for though you have strayed you are a son, and He will rejoice over you saying, "This my son was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found."

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

(The Real Presence.)

1 CORINTHIANS, xi., 23—26.

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread: And, when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is My body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament (or perhaps, the new covenant) in My blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show (proclaim R.V.) the Lord's death till He come."

The subject before us this evening is one of the most solemn and affecting that can engage our thoughts. We are drawing nigh to holy ground. All that is deepest and tenderest in our religious feelings has found its natural centre and home in the commemoration of our Saviour's dying love. In that last Supper He asked to be remembered, as He was about to give His body and His blood for the sin of the world, and the Christian Church has ever found in that commemoration the highest act of adoring worship and a blessed Sacrament of strengthening and refreshing to the soul. Men may differ, as they have differed, as to the meaning of the Sacrament, but no truly Christian heart will wish to make light of it. No one would question that it is, when

rightly used, a blessed means of grace. But all holy things may be perverted. We know they have been perverted. We know how the very anxiety to exalt the means of grace has led to their degradation, and how superstition and idolatry have invaded the very Sanctuary of God. We know how, at this moment, in a large part of Christendom, through the very desire to give an exaggerated and undue importance to this holy Sacrament, and together with this an exaggerated importance to the Christian priesthood, the laity have been robbed of their privilege by the withholding of the cup, a grossly material conception has been formed of our Lord's presence in the Sacrament, and an extremely rationalistic explanation given of the manner of that presence. Extremes meeting, as usual, superstition and rationalism have combined to destroy the very nature of a Sacrament. And, in our own Church, what has been called by its authors the Catholic Revival—though it is in truth only a mediæval revival—has brought back those very errors from which God of His mercy set us free at the Reformation. It was because they would not accept the doctrine of Transubstantiation that Cranmer and Ridley and Latimer and the noble army of our English martyrs gave up their lives to God in the fires. And yet now, in this 19th century, there is publicly taught and too generally received among us a doctrine which scarcely differs except in name from the doctrine which they abjured. And it is therefore very necessary to go back to the true and primitive view which has been so widely discarded, and to assert again firmly the truths which our Reformers asserted.

The words which I have chosen for my text contain the earliest account we have of the institution of the Lord's Supper. Because the Gospels stand first in our New Testament as containing the records of our Lord's earthly life, we are very apt to suppose that they were written first. But it is not so. St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians was written within thirty, probably within twenty-five years, after our Lord's death; and none of the Gospels is so early. Now what is it St. Paul tells us?

First. That the account which he gives us is one he received

directly by Revelation from the Lord. "*I received of the Lord* that which I also deliver unto you." Secondly, he recites the words of institution, not differing very materially from those which we find in the Gospels. Thirdly, he gives us the meaning and explanation of the rite, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come." Lastly, in the passage immediately following the text, he warns the Corinthians against an unworthy participation of the elements. "Whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgement unto himself, if he discern not the body."

There is yet one other passage in this Epistle in which St. Paul touches on the same subject (x., 14—22). He had been reminding the Corinthians there of the greatness of their spiritual privileges, and the danger of losing those privileges by the influence of the heathen, among whom they lived, and the lax morality which was prevalent among them. He pointed to the Jewish Church, great in privilege and rich in blessing, "All were under the cloud, all passed through the sea, all were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, all did eat the same spiritual meat, all drank the same spiritual drink; for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Christ." But a large part of them were none the better for all their advantages, they were overthrown in the wilderness. God sent His judgements upon them, and they perished; their privileges did not avail them, and their example is written as a warning and admonition to us upon whom the ends of the world are come. Now he goes on to say, "Stand in awe and sin not, flee from idolatry. You have greater privileges, you are admitted into a more blessed fellowship, you are not baptized into Moses, you have entered into a sacred society of which the Sacrament of the Lord's death is an abiding witness. To what does the Holy Communion pledge you? "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say, The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of

the body of Christ? seeing that we who are many (I quote from the Revised Version) are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread." Now, whatever else may be the meaning of these words, one thing is clear, that in the one bread or one loaf which was used at the Lord's Supper, St. Paul saw a speaking type or figure of the unity of the Christian Church. He passes from the thought of the body of our Lord, broken for us, and given to us, in the Eucharistic feast, to the thought of the mystical body of Christ. The bread on which we feed is His body broken on the Cross, the wine which we drink is His blood shed on the Cross. But He has another body of which this Sacrament reminds us. The Church is His body, and in that participation of the bread and wine we express our communion, our fellowship, one with another, and the one loaf is a witness to us of our oneness in Christ.

Now, in these two passages in this Epistle we have all that the New Testament directly teaches us as to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The great passage in the sixth chapter of St. John does not apply *directly* to the Lord's Supper. It could not do so. Our Lord was speaking in the synagogue at Capernaum to the gross and carnal multitudes, who followed Him because He had fed them with the loaves and fishes. They wanted an earthly captain, who would provide for their earthly needs; and He laid down for ever the necessity of the spiritual partaking and the spiritual food for all who would have everlasting life. The people had eaten of the loaves, their highest blessing would be to eat the Son of Man. He was the true bread: they that ate Him should live by Him. Without this eating there was no life, and no resurrection (v. 53). And further, this eating leads *necessarily* to life. Observe, there is no qualification, there is nothing about eating "worthily." It is absolutely and always true, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have *no* life." "He that eateth Me shall live by Me." But our Lord has no where said, Scripture has no where said, "Except ye partake of the Holy Communion ye have no life in you." All that is spoken in that chapter of St. John of "eating the bread

which came down from heaven, eating the flesh of the Son of Man, eating His flesh and drinking His blood, of eating Him, eating the bread which cometh down from heaven, has no direct reference to the Holy Communion, and cannot be prophetic of that Sacrament.* They are spiritual realities which our Lord sets forth, "with which no external act as such can be co-extensive." "Believe and thou hast eaten," says St. Augustine. Faith makes us partakers of Christ. By faith we feed on Him; by faith we are one with Him. On the other hand, the Holy Communion is a means of our feeding on Christ. The truth which is presented to us in these words of our blessed Lord as an everlasting truth, irrespective of all times and ordinances, is taught us also in the Holy Communion—it finds its application there. The act of partaking gathers it up, so to speak, and presents it to us in a form calculated to arrest and impress our minds. It compels us to reflect. There are other hours in which we feed on Christ; there are other times of deep and blessed communion with Him; there are other seasons of which it may be said,

"Sweet the moments, rich in blessing,
Which beneath the Cross I spend,
Life and health and peace possessing;
From the sinner's dying Friend."

That is true in the secret chamber, that is true in the public worship. But in the Supper we are called upon to "remember." Our dull and sluggish souls are stirred and kindled afresh. Our wandering thoughts are recalled. Christ our Lord is seated again at the Table dispensing to us with His pierced Hands the sacred memorials of His passion to our great and endless comfort. We gaze and love and worship. But now, looking at the language of St. Paul, looking at the language of St. John, as having a bearing upon the Holy Communion, though not a primary reference to it, how different it all is from the strange fantastic systems of Church theology that have been grafted on these. What a vast parasitic overgrowth of error has disguised and disfigured the simple truths of the Gospel. Christ instituted that Sacrament as

* It should be observed that in St. John vi. our Lord speaks of His *flesh* as that which is to be eaten; in all the accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper He speaks of His *body*.

the Sacrament of His *death*. It was His body *broken* and His blood *shed* which were given in it. It was His *death* St. Paul said which was proclaimed by it till His coming again. All who partake of the bread and wine feed on that death. Spiritually, they eat His body and drink His blood. They feed not on the glorified risen Christ, but on Christ our passover, who was sacrificed for us. Spiritually, all the virtue of that precious death becomes theirs; they obtain by it remission of their sins and all other benefits of His passion. And further, it is a realization of that Christian fellowship and communion, one with another, which is signified by the one loaf which is broken in the Eucharist. How different, I say, is all this from later systems of theology, from all that is now so frequently and so passionately asserted as necessary to salvation.

There is another point on which I cannot forbear remarking, viz., the different *place* which the Holy Communion occupies in the New Testament relatively to other truths from that which it occupies in certain modern teaching. In three of the Gospels we have merely the institution of the Sacrament. In the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians we have an account both of the institution and of its doctrinal significance. And that is all. And yet we are told now that it is not only a means of grace, but a great and solemn sacrifice—a re-presentation by the priest on earth of that which the Great Intercessor is doing in heaven, who is there re-presenting His one sacrifice before the Father. Turn to the Epistle of the Hebrews, that splendid interpretation of the Old Testament, that grand exposition of all the sacrifices of the Law,—there, if anywhere, surely we should have looked for some reference, some allusion to this doctrine if it were true: yet, so absolutely silent is that Epistle, that even when the writer is setting forth the priesthood of Melchisedec as the type and pattern of our Lord's priesthood, he says not one word of that on which later writers have seized so eagerly as typical of the Eucharist, the fact that Melchisedec brought forth bread and wine when he met Abraham on his return from battle. The Fathers are eloquent on this point, the Fathers see here a prophecy

of the Eucharist. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, though he dwells more than any other writer on the significance of the Old Testament, though he enlarges upon the priesthood of Melchisedec, though he says that he was made like unto, designed to be a pattern of, the Son of God in His eternal priesthood, yet does not so much as allude to this particular in the narrative.

We are told that the partaking of the Eucharist is the means by which our union with Christ is maintained. We are incorporated unto Him in baptism, that is the beginning of our union with Him, and in the Holy Communion it is said that spiritual life is cherished and maintained. Turn to the Epistle to the Ephesians, that Epistle which more than any other enters into the heights and depths of the spiritual life, that Epistle which more than any other speaks of the spiritual indwelling of Christ in the heart of the believer, and from beginning to end there is no allusion to the Holy Communion.

We are told that this great Festival is not only the chief feast of the Church and her greatest act of worship, but that it should be invested with solemn awe, and that rites and ceremonies and vestments should be multiplied in order to clothe it with fitting splendour, and to do honour to the Saviour present in the Sacrament, who is there to be adored under the forms of bread and wine. Turn to the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul, so full of instruction to the Christian minister as to the discharge of his duties, and yet not only does he nowhere say a word of any priestly functions to be exercised by the minister, but from beginning to end there is not a single allusion to the Lord's Supper.

Do not let me be misunderstood. Do not think I wish you to disregard this Holy Sacrament. God forbid I should even seem to discourage attendance at it, or to speak as if it were a matter of indifference. They who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth will love to remember Him, and most of all will they love to remember Him where He Himself asks them to remember Him, in the Holy Supper of His dying love. I do believe that in that Holy Sacrament He gives to all who draw near with repentance and faith His very body to be spiritual food and

His very blood to be spiritual drink. I believe we may draw life there from His wounded side, and find the pardon of our sins to our great and endless comfort,—there, though not only there,—there in a solemn act of recollection, done in obedience to His dying command. But what I am desirous of pointing out is that there may be a morbid and unhealthy exaggeration of truth; Holy Scripture does *not* make the Holy Communion the centre and pivot of the Christian life. It is a blessed means of grace, it may be the highest means, but it is only a means, and it is not the only means. And if we are to preach the truth, as St. Paul and St. Peter and St. John preached it, we shall be careful to present all parts of divine truth in their proper relation to one another, and not to dwell on one to the disregard of all others. It is possible so to isolate a truth as to distort it and all other truths in consequence. It is possible so to insist upon an external act as to substitute it for, or at least to eclipse, the spiritual truth which it signifies. And when we see how the very sense of the blessedness of the Sacrament, how the very feelings of reverence and awe and tender affection which it has called forth, as the memorial of our Lord's dying love, have led to the most grievous perversion, how worship has degenerated into idolatry, how the spiritual has been degraded into the material, how Christians have fallen back into conceptions scarcely less gross and carnal than those of the Jews at Capernaum—we cannot be too careful lest we be taken in the net of the same error.

Now, recent controversy has turned on two points connected with the Sacrament, and on both of these I shall say a few words, not indeed that I can exhaust the subject, but I shall endeavour to place each of these points in its true light, because I feel satisfied that a great deal of false and unscriptural teaching is prevalent concerning them.

I. The first of these is what is called the Doctrine of the Real Presence.

II. The second is the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

I. Now, as regards the Doctrine of the Real Presence, I shall not trouble you this evening with any explanation, either of the

Romish or the Lutheran phases of the doctrine. They do not immediately concern us. What does concern us is the teaching now prevalent in the Church of England. It is briefly this. That under the forms of bread and wine Christ Himself is really present. "Where God's Almighty word causes His body to be," says one great theological teacher, "*there* His Godhead is because it is inseparable; *there* is Christ Himself our Redeeming Lord, the object of our thankfulness and reverence, and love, and adoration." And again, "Why then should we think it too strange a thing for His marvellous condescension that He should now give us His blessed Body and Blood under the form of bread and wine? Or how should His body which He gives us not be His living life-giving Body? Or how should His life-giving Body be apart from His Godhead which makes it life-giving? Or how, since His Godhead is present there, should we not adore?"*

And another writer of the same School speaks of the Presence of our Lord's Body, "the very Presence of His humanity as dwelling in the consecrated elements;" and it is argued to meet the difficulty and the objection that a true human body cannot be in more than one place at one time, that it is not subject to the laws of material existence, because "His body is a glorified body, which has new qualities gained by its oneness with Deity; for it is the Body of God." According then to this modern theology, at the moment of consecration, Christ unites Himself, body, soul, and divinity, with the elements of bread and wine, so that it is as it were a kind of new Incarnation, and consequently that Christ Himself present under the forms of bread and wine is there to be worshipped. Now I utterly reject this teaching. First, because it has no foundation in Scripture, and none in antiquity. Some ancient Fathers do indeed speak of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, but in a very different sense from this. They use it only in that sense in which He Himself promised, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." But the term, "Real Presence," in any sense at all approaching that in which it is now

* Pusey, "The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church," p. 330.

used, as inseparately connected with the elements themselves, was unknown till the era of the Reformation, and some considerable time after the doctrine of Transubstantiation had been laid down by the Fourth Lateran Council. Then it was that men began to define the mode of the Presence. Then it was that the Church of Rome laid down that the Presence of the glorified humanity was there by virtue of the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood, and Luther taught that Christ Himself was present together with the elements, so that the one was not separate from the other,—and now following these, and distinguishing and refining, a party in the English Church insists, that in and under the forms of the bread and wine Christ our Lord is present in His human nature and in His Godhead, and as present there is to be adored. But now, all these different views diverging from one another in some respects agree in this : They all insist that the words, "This is my body" and "This is my blood" are to be taken literally. And they all omit the important words which follow, My body, "which is given for you"; My blood, "which is shed for you." They all overlook the fact that these are two separate significant acts : the bread broken, signifying the breaking of the body on the Cross, the wine poured out, signifying the blood shed on the Cross. And hence they confuse the two, and write and speak as if our Lord had used only one act, and had spoken only of His body and blood. And then they assume He spoke of His glorified humanity in Heaven and not of His sacrifice in the Cross. And it is this assumption which has led to so much false teaching on the subject.

I too believe that the words are to be taken literally. I too believe that what our Blessed Lord said He meant. I believe that Christ's body and Christ's blood are truly and really in the Sacrament. I believe that the bread broken is His body, and the wine poured out is His blood. But how and in what sense ? Not His literal body broken, nor His literal blood shed, for these no longer exist ;—the body which Christ now has is in heaven a glorified body ;—but the body and the blood, in the only sense in

which they can be present, viz., the spiritual efficacy of His sacrifice. And then holding that, it inevitably follows that they only can partake of that body and that blood who partake by faith. Do I make my meaning clear? This is no mere quibble of words. I go back to the original institution. Whatever our Lord gave then, He gives now. What He gave then was not His glorified humanity but His sacrifice on the Cross. It was on that sacrifice shortly to be accomplished that His disciples were to feed. The blood shed for the remission of sins was in that cup. Was it there literally, or was it there in spiritual efficacy? And if in spiritual efficacy only, who then could partake of it? None assuredly but they who partake with a lively faith.

And this I believe to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Happily, although many of the great divines of the Church of England have used the term Real Presence, our Church has avoided it. It does not occur in her Articles, her Communion Service, or her Catechism. Those of our divines who have used it have done so with the desire on the one hand to show that the Church of England looks for and receives all that the Church of Rome professes to give, though in a different and undefined manner, leaving it a mystery to be embraced by faith and not too curiously explained; and on the other hand to show that our Church has no sympathy with those who see only a bare sign in the Sacraments. But the term is not found in her authorized documents, and according to any view it is quite unnecessary. Where Christ is present, He is really present—where His body and blood are present, they are really present—the adjective "Real" is superfluous.

Now let us glance at the doctrine of the Church of England on this question. What does she say in her Catechism? She defines what are Sacraments. She says that there are two parts in a Sacrament, the outward and the inward. First we have in each Sacrament the outward and visible sign, and then the inward and spiritual grace. The outward and visible sign in this Sacrament is the bread and wine. The inward and spiritual grace is the body and blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken by

the faithful in the Lord's Supper. Not one word here of Real Presence, or of Christ's glorified humanity. But it is argued if they are verily and indeed taken, they must be there. Certainly, if it were a carnal or a material presence it must be there; if that be our conception of a Real Presence, it must be there. But a spiritual feast requires no presence *there* in order to partake of it. Spiritual food and drink may be taken as really as bodily food and drink, may refresh our souls indeed, though it be not present at all except to faith.

Look at the Communion Service: "It is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God our Heavenly Father, for that He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ not only to die for us, but to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament." Read the Exhortation: "The benefit is great if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament; for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us." Turn to the Prayer of Humble Access: "Grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood." Observe the words in which the minister gives the bread and wine: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee—the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee—preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." What is this body? What is this blood? Not the body in heaven. Not the glorified body at the Father's right hand. But His body and His blood as they were on the Cross, and that body and that blood exist nowhere in the compass of creation—no, not in heaven itself—and no natural or material or objective presence of them is possible. And it is not said that the body and blood of Christ are received by the *unfaithful*. We feed on Him only "if with a true penitent heart and living faith we receive His Holy Sacrament." There must be a due reception, there must be a true faith in order to receive any spiritual benefit. And so the Article asserts: "The

body of Christ is given, taken and eaten—mark, *given* as well as *taken*—in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." And so to adopt the words of Richard Hooker, which have been so often quoted on this subject: "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. And with this the very order of our Saviour's words agreeth: first, 'Take, eat'; then, 'This is my body which was broken for you': first, 'Drink ye all of this'; then followeth, 'This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body, and the cup His blood; but only in the very heart and soul of Him which receiveth them. As for the Sacraments, they really exhibit, but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them they are not really nor do really contain in themselves the grace which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow."

A brief word in conclusion. Knowing and believing that the Holy Communion is a precious means of grace, let us come thankfully to that heavenly feast. We call Jesus Christ our Master, and He bids us come. We are sinners who need to be cleansed from our sins, and He promises us cleansing there, though not only there. We need help and strength for our conflict with sin and evil and He vouchsafes to feed us there with the most precious food of His body and blood. But do not let us imagine that the Sacrament will work as a charm; or as a magical incantation. To dream that it will thus operate is the vainest of all vain delusions. We are not the better, necessarily, because we partake of that Holy Supper. It will not make us holy, it will not change our nature, it has no virtue of itself save to those who are worthy partakers. Much less shall we receive any benefit if we only gaze at the celebration of a rite in which we are not partakers. We are no nearer to Christ nor He to us. Then only is the benefit great, if coming with a true penitent heart and lively faith, we eat of that bread and drink of that cup. Then only

are we one with Christ and Christ with us. And next, do not let us suppose that the Sacrament begins and ends with itself. Do not let us think that we may receive that Holy Sacrament and that it pledges us to nothing. It reminds us of what ought to be the perpetual attitude of our hearts and lives. It tells us, it speaks eloquently to us, of a daily feeding on Christ, of a daily coming to the Fountain open for sin and uncleanness, of a daily occasion to exercise brotherly love, and to draw closer together those spiritual bonds in which as Christians we are bound one to another. It reminds us that without Him we can do nothing; that as He gives us His most precious body and blood in that Holy Sacrament, so He gives us all spiritual succour and refreshment whenever and wherever we draw near Him in faith. It is a witness to us that as He loved us and gave Himself for us, so we are not our own, but are bought with a price; that He claims us for His service and sends us forth, His consecrated priests with the sprinkled blood upon our consciences, that we may glorify God in our body and in our spirit which are His.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

(The Eucharistic Sacrifice.)

HEBREWS ix., 24—28 (Revised Version).

"For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us: nor yet that He should offer Himself often; as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with blood not his own; else must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once at the end of the ages hath He been manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And inasmuch as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this cometh judgement; so Christ also, having been once offered to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, apart from sin, to them that wait for Him, unto salvation."

In my last sermon I pointed out that the whole controversy concerning the Lord's Supper has turned upon these two points: (1) The Doctrine of what is termed the Real Presence, and (2) The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Both these expressions, it must be remembered, belong not to Scripture but to later systems of theology. They are the product of human speculation enquiring too curiously concerning mysteries on which revelation has told us nothing. Neither the one nor the other mode of expression has been adopted by the Church of England. It is a plain evidence of that sober moderation, of that close adherence to Scripture, by which all her formularies are marked,

that she has refused to sanction them. Some of her great divines have indeed been less careful. They have used the one term or the other, or both. But no loyal son of the Church of England is bound to accept either; much less is he bound to accept at the bidding of some self-constituted authority what any individual is pleased to call "the Catholic doctrine" of the Real Presence or the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. There is no "Catholic doctrine" of the one or the other, and it is the merest arrogance to assert it or to claim assent to it. The term Real Presence, as I reminded you two Sundays ago, is a comparatively modern term. It is not found as applied to the Eucharist in any ancient Father. The earliest known instance of its occurrence is not earlier than the time of the Reformation. It occurs in a Letter addressed by the Hussites in Bohemia to Ladislaus, in which they maintain that "the words of our Saviour Jesus Christ said nothing of the Real Presence." Obviously they must have been referring to it as a term at that time employed by their adversaries in the Church of Rome. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, had indeed spoken of a Real Presence of our Lord dwelling in heaven but of any Real Presence in or with the bread and wine no trace, I believe, has been found before the 16th century.* I do not say that this necessarily proves that the expression is wrong or false. It is conceivable that a phrase may be of comparatively late invention, and yet aptly express a truth which has long been acknowledged. The truth may be there, the doctrine may be taught, before the word has been found which shall give it most convenient expression, just as the doctrine of the Trinity was taught and recognized though the word Trinity dates only from the close of the 2nd century after Christ. Still the extremely late occurrence of the term in this instance would seem to shew that the doctrine which it denotes was not a doctrine generally received, and at least justifies us in demanding that a clear and satisfactory explanation be given of it, and that it be shown to be a proper and adequate expression of a generally received truth.

* See Vogan, *True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 91.

But as I pointed out to you the very expression itself rests upon an error. That error is common to the Roman system, the Lutheran system, and the system which has lately become prevalent in the Church of England. The Roman system, or Transubstantiation, teaches a change of the substance of the consecrated elements into the substance of the whole humanity and Divinity of Christ; the Lutheran system maintains a presence of the whole Christ, God and man, together with the substance of the bread and wine; and the new doctrine holds a presence of the glorified humanity of Christ under the forms of bread and wine. One and all of these systems are alike in omitting some of the most important words of institution. They all stop short at the words "This is my body," and omit the words "given, (broken) for you"; they stop short at the words "This is my blood," and omit the words "shed for you." Thus they lose sight altogether of that which is essential in the Sacrament. It is the Sacrament of Christ's death, not the Sacrament of His glorified humanity. That which Christ gives us there is His body broken and His blood poured out upon the Cross. The bread and the wine are that body and that blood in the only sense in which it is possible that they can be either given or received. For literally that body and that blood do not exist. The only body which now literally exists is the body of His glorified humanity and *that* is not given in the Sacrament. The body of His death, the blood of His death, are given and received, and as these do not literally exist anywhere in heaven or in earth, they can only be given and received after a spiritual manner. In other words, as it is in remembrance of His death and passion that we receive the bread and wine, so it is the efficacy of that death which is there imparted to every believing soul. And that virtue, or as Hooker says the Real Presence—if you choose to adopt the term—of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. Brethren, this is not to lower the Sacrament, this is not to make it a common thing. I do not believe we can go to it with too deep a devotion, with too sincere a repentance, with too lively a faith. I believe that

Christ Jesus our Risen and Ascended Lord does give us there remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion; I believe "that if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, we are one with Christ and Christ with us;" but I do not believe that there is any presence of Christ in or under the forms of bread and wine. The presence is a presence to faith, a presence not in the hand but in the heart of him who receives. And I can conceive of only two kinds of presence: a literal presence or a figurative presence; a presence to sense, to sight, to touch, which is a corporal presence, or a presence to the mind and heart which is a spiritual presence. Between these two I know of none. But here is an attempt to conceive of the spiritual as held in and presented under material forms; and it is this which has been so pernicious; it is this which has led to such gross coarse material views of the Sacrament; it is this which has led to the reservation of the Sacrament as if in some way Christ Himself were inseparably attached to the consecrated elements; it is this which has led to the notion that Christ present in the elements is in them to be adored; it is this which has led to that most ensnaring and delusive doctrine of fasting communion, a doctrine which strikes at the very root of faith, a doctrine according to which Christ the King of Glory is believed actually to enter with the bread and wine into our bodies, which are supposed to be the more pure and clean for the reception of the Heavenly Guest, because we have not suffered food to pass our mouths, and this in direct defiance of the plain words of our Blessed Lord, "That which entereth into a man defileth not a man."*

I reject therefore the whole of that theory, the fruit of the rationalizing materialistic speculations of mediæval schoolmen, adopted and stereotyped by the Church of Rome, which connects the presence of Christ with the material elements so soon as the

* And this must inevitably lead to another piece of gross materialism; for the Heavenly Visitant must depart before food can again be lawfully taken; to return again, when after fasting, the Sacrament is again received.

words of consecration have been pronounced by the priest, thus converting a spiritual reality into a mere magical rite. Some of the purer and loftier spirits of that Church have at least in their better moments risen above this gross materialism. In the very interesting *Autobiography* of Father Gratry, he tells us how whilst yet a boy, in the fervour of his early religious impressions, he was longing for the time when he should be admitted to his first communion. The longing became so intense within him that he could not sleep; and, rising from his bed, he took a piece of bread, and kneeling down in his chamber prayed fervently that it might become to him the body and blood of Christ; and, he adds, that he believes that his prayer was answered. Why should we doubt it? But if so, what becomes of the whole vast assumption of priestly power as necessary to the consecration? How emphatically the presence is a presence to faith. How truly the virtue of Christ's sacrifice belongs to the worthy receiver. Brethren, I wish to impose no limits and to lay down no definitions which our Church has not defined or laid down. She leaves ample room in her service for devout meditation, she encourages a humble access to Christ and to the Father, she bids us expect every blessing we can desire. But she says nothing of any Real Presence. She does not trouble us with abstruse arguments concerning it, or with metaphysical speculations. She bids us kneel down at that table reverently, meekly, with contrite hearts, with a lively faith, with praise and thanksgiving; she bids us feed on Christ, and have communion with Him and with one another. And what more do we need? Is it not enough to say in the language of Hooker, "O my God thou art true, O my soul thou art happy."

II. But I turn now to the other question which has of late assumed great prominence, viz., what is called the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice in connection with the Lord's Supper.

And here again, as I said before, we are confronted with a term which has no place in our Prayer Book, the only sacrifices mentioned in our Communion office being the spiritual sacrifices of "praise and thanksgiving," and the offering of "ourselves, our

souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice" unto God.

But as we owe the novel statement of the doctrine of the Real Presence to a desire to approach as nearly as possible to the Church of Rome, so we owe this whole doctrine of a sacrifice in the Eucharist in its modern form to the same source. This too is nothing but a modification of Romish doctrine where it is not a direct assertion of it.

What is the doctrine of the Church of Rome in this matter? It is worth while to examine it because it has been so closely copied in our own Church. I will give it in the exact words of the Council of Trent (Sess. xxii., cap. 1).

After stating that, according to the teaching of St. Paul, it was necessary, inasmuch as there could be no perfection under the Law because of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood, that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedec who should be able to perfect them that were to be sanctified, the Council proceeds:—"He therefore, our Lord God, although he was about to offer himself to God the Father once for all on the altar of the Cross in His death, that he might accomplish eternal redemption there, nevertheless because his priesthood was not to be abolished by death, in the last Supper on the night that he was betrayed, that he might leave a visible sacrifice to his beloved spouse the Church, such as human nature requires:"—I pause on those words: Those words contain the secret of all the perversions of God's truth for which the Church of Rome is responsible. *Such as human nature requires.* On this plea she drags down and materialises spiritual verities that she may bring them within the comprehension of man's low and carnal thoughts. Instead of lifting up human nature out of its dull sluggish sensualism, instead of seeking to awaken faith and to kindle the spiritual being, instead of raising and elevating it by setting before it Divine and supernatural verities to be embraced by faith, she degrades the spiritual verities and drags them down and clothes them in gross material forms and so substitutes sight for faith. Thus she reverses the Divine order, she pronounces those more

blessed who see than those who believe, and makes man two-fold more the slave of sense than he was before—"Such as human nature requires, in order that the bloody sacrifice, once for all to be accomplished on the Cross might be represented and its memory continue to the end of the world, and its salutary virtue be applied for the remission of those sins which are daily committed by us, declaring that he is appointed a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, presented His body and blood under the forms of bread and wine to God the Father, and under the symbols of the same things delivered them to the Apostles to take, whom He then appointed priests of the new testament; and commanded them and their successors in the priesthood to offer by means of these words: This do in remembrance (or commemoration) of me; as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught."

And the Church of Rome then proceeds to pronounce her anathemas against all who shall say "that there is not offered to God in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice," or who shall say that Christ did not in the words of institution "appoint His apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His body and blood," or who shall deny that the sacrifice of the Mass is "propitiatory," " or that it profits only the receiver and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities." This is the doctrine of the Church of Rome as it appears in her own authorized statements.

How is it possible to bring into any kind of harmony statements and doctrines of this kind with the words of our Liturgy and of our Articles? It might have seemed indeed to any honest mind, not clouded by the vapours of Romish sophistry, the most hopeless of all attempts to reconcile the teaching of the two Churches on this point. "It can hardly be denied," observes the late Bishop Thirlwell, "that there is a very wide and important difference between the general view which our Church takes of her Liturgy and the Roman view of the Mass. The difference is marked by their several names and descriptions. The one is

an office for the administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion; the other for the celebration of a sacrifice. The difference indicated by the titles is equally conspicuous in the contents of the two Liturgies. In the Anglican, the idea which is almost exclusively predominant is that of communion. There is indeed an offertory, and an oblation of common things for sacred and charitable uses. There is mention of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which appears to include the whole rite; and the communicants "offer and present themselves, their souls, and bodies as a living sacrifice." But of any other kind of sacrifice, and particularly of any sacrificial oblation of the consecrated elements, there is not a word. The consecration is immediately followed by the communion, which is the great business of the whole. On the other hand, the Council of Trent pronounces an anathema on those who say that there is not offered to God in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice, or that the offering consists only in Christ's being given to us for manducation; or that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice on the Cross, and not propitiatory. A more direct conflict of views, if they are supposed to relate to the same subject, or to two subjects not essentially different from one another, it would be difficult to conceive; for that which the Council so emphatically denies to be the sacrifice of the Mass, is the only thing to which our Church gives the name of *her* sacrifice. That which the Council declares to be the true and proper sacrifice of the Mass is an offering as to which our Church is absolutely silent." Nay more, it may be said that the Church has deliberately rejected the doctrine. For in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., "every expression which implied a real and proper sacrifice had been carefully weeded out;" in the Second Book every allusion to an "altar" or to a material sacrifice was finally got rid of; the word altar thenceforward disappearing from the Liturgy. And at the last revision, when Bishop Cosin proposed to insert as a Rubric "the Priest shall *offer up* and place upon the Table ..... bread and wine (although this offering up must have been that of the unconsecrated

elements and therefore different from the Romish doctrine) yet Convocation rejected the proposal.

And it is to be observed that even as regards the unconsecrated elements, the word "offering" is avoided in the Rubric before the Prayer for the Church Militant, for it is simply said that the priest is then to "*place upon the Table* so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient". Whereas of the bason containing the alms it is directed that he shall *humbly present** and place it upon the holy Table.

And further, the language of the Thirty-first Article is aimed directly against the Romish doctrine. "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."†

And yet, in spite of all this, we find the deliberate and disingenuous attempt made to obliterate this broad and palpable distinction between the two Churches. English clergymen do not hesitate to speak of the Lord's Supper as the Sacrifice of the altar or the Mass. Prayers from the Canon of the Mass are interpolated into the service which the priest is to say secretly; instructions are given how he is to consecrate the elements and pour water into the chalice, and how he is to make the oblation, viz.: by placing the paten on the top of the chalice, and raising the latter with both hands whilst he says secretly, "O Holy Trinity, accept this Oblation which I, an unworthy sinner, do offer to the honour of Thy Name, making mention of Blessed Mary and All Saints for the pardon of my sins and offences, for

* The modern Ritualistic version of this Rubric is "shall ostentatiously present;" for the bason is lifted high above the head before it is placed on the Table.

† Attempts have been made to show that our Church does not here condemn authorised Romish doctrine, but vulgar belief. The disingenuousness and futility of such attempts have been thoroughly exposed by the late Bishop of Exeter in his Letters to Charles Butler, p. 319—321.

the salvation of the living and for the repose of all the faithful departed—In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be this new Sacrifice acceptable to Almighty God."*

English Churchmen are taught to pray after receiving the Sacrament :

"I thank Thee, O my good Jesus, that not only Thou art become my food, but also in the Blessed Sacrament offerest Thyself a continual sacrifice for my salvation to the Eternal Father."

"I thank Thee, Divine Priest, for that every day Thou dost offer Thyself upon our altar in worship and homage to the most blessed Trinity, and dost supply for our poor and miserable worship."

"I thank Thee, O my Saviour, because continuing in this daily sacrifice the very sacrifice of the Cross offered on Calvary, Thou dost satisfy the Divine justice for us miserable sinners."†

What are we to say when we thus find Romish doctrine transplanted in all its unscriptural repulsiveness into our own Church? What are we to say when, in a Manual of devotion, recommended in a volume published with a preface by the Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology at Oxford, it is asserted that so soon as the words of consecration are pronounced by the priest "Jesus our wonderful God is *present upon the altar*, that there is a continual offering and continual consumption of the Lamb without spot," and consequently prayers addressed "to the spotless Lamb of God as seen on *the heavenly altar*" (a most gross perversion of the scene in the Apocalypse) ; or again, when in the *Altar Manual*, the Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper is declared to be "a sin offering," that it is one of "propitiation," that it consists of "the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," and that it is "part of the same offering" which He Himself made!‡

And yet with all these statements made so confidently concerning a sacrifice of which both Scripture and the Prayer Book are silent, we find the greatest divergence of opinion when we come to particulars.

* *English Priests' Vade Mecum*, p. 49.
† *English Catholic's Vade Mecum*, p. 57. ‡ pp. 10, 12, 161, 157.

We ask, what is the offering itself? What is the thing offered? Is it the elements before or after consecration? Or, in the latter case, is it our Lord Jesus Christ Himself offered under the forms of bread and wine? And if it is, then it is not the sacrifice on the Cross which is offered or pleaded, but our Lord in His glorified human nature who is asserted to be present under the forms of bread and wine. The very statement of such a notion is its sufficient refutation. We ask what is the *act* by which the sacrifice is offered, and the *moment* at which it is offered? We ask, and the answers are vague and discordant. One affirms that the offering takes place when the words of institution are uttered; another, "that it is offered when the prayer of consecration is said;" another, that it is "a *further* act, after the change by consecration"; another, "that it must of necessity have place either at the time of the consecration only, *or* be to some extent coincident with it, *or* both then and after;" yet another connects the sacrificial action "with the whole Eucharistic Service."

Only on certain points it may perhaps be said there is substantial agreement between those who hold the new doctrine. They all maintain "that in heaven Christ our great High Priest ever offers Himself before the Father, that He is still offering Himself as a sacrifice," that He is still to be regarded as a victim, that He is there not merely pleading for us but renewing His oblation of Himself, that His intercession does not rest merely on a past act of sacrifice, but on a continued offering of His own everliving sacrifice made once only in the act of Death on the Cross; that there is "a continuing so to say of the sacrificial position," "a presentation of Himself in the Victim State, a prolongation as it were of the one act fulfilled on Calvary, though under different circumstances and conditions." He is not laid as one dying on an altar; there is not "any further offering in death"—no "bloody sacrifice." His offering is without pain, it implies no death, no suffering, no immolation as of a victim laid on the altar to be slain. It is part of His unchangeable priesthood, according to the same writer, that He should there offer Himself in one continuing

offering. His continued existence is the ground of His continued offering. He offers Himself as "living," because He ever liveth. His offering ever liveth; and "having offered Himself in time past in death, He still lives with undying power to continue His offering." "He is ever offering that sacrifice through which sins are being remitted. On the virtue of this offering, thus perpetually appearing on our behalf before the Father, His pleading intercession *rests for its acceptance* . . . . . He is not merely pleading for us, but ever renewing His oblation of Himself, and on this *ceaseless* act of self-devotion *grounding* His intercession for us. Neither the perpetual sacrifice in heaven nor the Christian sacrifice on earth can be adequately represented as an *actual prayer*. Both are to be regarded most mysteriously, but most truly as a *continuation* of the one sacrifice by the One Priest." "The Eucharistic worship which He has ordained" (says Mr. Sadler) "is we verily believe the re-presentation and counterpart of this His presentation of Himself as our Mediator in heaven." So in the Liturgy, the oblation is said to be a real substantial act, the *ground* of praise and thanksgiving which are offered" together with it. "We do not speak of Christ's Atonement as a work wholly past but as of one ever going on."

And why all this elaborate assertion as to our Lord's office and work in heaven? Why this audacious interpretation of the mysterious work behind the veil? Why this intruding into things which have not been revealed—this rash and confident utterance where Scripture is silent? All, that this conclusion may follow, "that as He ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father" in heaven, so on earth in the Holy Eucharist that same body once for all sacrificed for us, and that same Blood once for all shed for us, sacramentally present, are *offered* and pleaded before the Father by the priest. "The heavenly setting forth is of course not for praise and thanksgiving so much as for *deprecation* of wrath . . . . . and so the Eucharist, which is the earthly counterpart of the heavenly setting forth, must also be for deprecation of wrath." Hence the Eucharistic Sacrifice is said to be "atoning," "propitiatory," profitable to the absent,

the dead, for fair weather and to cattle. The benefits of the "Eucharistic Sacrifice" are held to be "connected with the Sacrament as *an act of oblation*, NOT as an act of communion"* The Cross of Christ it is said "would not be profitable to us unless it were applied and brought into effect by the Eucharistic Sacrifice." "Priests reconcile God to man."

Now, be it remembered, that some of this language comes not from extreme members of the party; that teaching like this is accepted and defended at this moment by a large body of English churchmen. And I ask, is this the voice of England or the voice of Rome? And if it is the voice of Rome, is it honest for the men who hold this language to minister in our Church? Such teaching is in flagrant opposition to the teaching of our Articles and our Liturgy.

But certain as it is that the language of the Prayer Book is opposed to such teaching, is any support to be found for it in Holy Scripture? Never perhaps was there such a complete perversion and twisting of texts as in the attempt to find support in Scripture for these strange doctrines. Thus it is assumed that when Melchisedec brought forth bread and wine, he *offered* bread and wine, which is the very thing that has to be proved. Nowhere is there any proof that bread and wine ever constituted a sacrifice at all. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, as I pointed out in my last sermon, though it deals with the sacrifices of the Old Testament, as no other book of Scripture does, not one word is said of this action of Melchisedec's as having a typical character; and certainly, it could not have been even typically an offering for sin, since bread and wine never formed part of a sin-offering. The prophecy of Malachi that the Gentiles should offer incense and a pure offering is not more in point. "Incense" has been almost universally interpreted in the passage in a spiritual sense of prayer; and "the pure offering" must likewise be interpreted not of the Eucharist but in a spiritual sense as many of the Fathers do expound it of "the rendering of glory, benediction, praise and hymns;" of "sincere prayer for a pure

* Blunt's Annotated P.B, p. 157.

conscience, the prayers of the saints and the wills of those who offered." Or again, can there be a more complete and unwarrantable perversion of scriptural language than when we are told that the Lamb is *seen on the heavenly altar*, a continual victim? The Lamb as it had been slain is described not as being on an altar, nor as being slain, nor as being offered, but as "standing," alive again for evermore, "in the midst of the Throne" receiving Divine worship. And as the Church in heaven sing, "Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us," so the Church on earth adds, "for He is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us and *hath taken* away the sin of the world."

And lastly, the whole teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews is directly contrary to this notion of a continuous sacrifice. It is quite true that if our Lord is a Priest, He must have somewhat to offer, but it is not true that He must have somewhat to offer continually. A Priest implies a victim, but it does not imply a perpetual victim. The form of expression in the Greek gives no countenance to the notion of a present or future oblation. It merely states the "necessity" that He should have somewhat to offer, *whatever be the moment of the oblation*. The sacrifice was once for all made on the Cross. The offering was once made, and with the blood of the offering, by means of it and its meritorious efficacy, He entered into the holy place. There He pleads, there He intercedes for us, but He does not repeat or re-present His sacrifice. The Epistle to the Hebrews is most explicit on this point. It guards us against the notion of any repetition of the sacrifice. It tells us that by one offering He hath for ever perfected them that were sanctified; that we are sanctified through the will of God by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all*. It tells us that He "needeth not daily, as those High Priests, (under the law) to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people's; for this (that is, offering for the people's sins) he did *once for all*, when he offered up Himself." It tells us that "Christ being come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more prefect tabernacle, not made with hands—that is to say, not of this creation, nor yet through the

blood of goats and calves, but through His own blood entered in *once for all* into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." He pleads the sacrifice there, but, He does not represent the sacrifice which was *once for all* accomplished. "For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us: nor yet that He should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place year by year with the blood of others, else must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world. But now once in the end of the ages hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." It is perfectly plain then, if words have any meaning at all, that the whole tenour of the Epistle to the Hebrews is directly against the view in support of which its advocates appeal to that Epistle. It speaks of but one offering, and that offering *once for all* made, not repeated, not re-presented, either by Christ in Heaven or by his ministers upon earth. We do indeed offer in that Holy Supper all spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. Melted by the remembrance of that death of which we are then with such inexpressible solemnity and tenderness reminded, our hearts touched and kindled by the thought and the sense of that "exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ dying for us," how can we choose but yield ourselves to Him with renewed vows of grateful obedience? In that solemn service He has drawn near to us and we to Him, He has given us the sacred memorials of His death and passion, He has given us His flesh to eat and His blood to drink, cleansing our sinful bodies by His body, and washing our souls in His most precious blood.

Deep indeed should be our humiliation as we draw nigh, for we know what we there proclaim, even that Death on the Cross which our sins made necessary. Great cause have we to examine ourselves whether we truly repent of our sins. Well may we confess that the burden of them is intolerable. We are standing in sight of the Cross. The body broken and the blood shed are before the eyes of our hearts. It is the Passion of our Saviour Christ—

both God and man. Surely this must touch our hearts, surely we must feel our own unworthiness and His unspeakable love. And when we partake it is His blood which is sprinkled upon our consciences. It is this sacrifice which is applied to our hearts, and thus pardoned, reconciled, bidden to draw near, we can come with confidence to our Heavenly Father.

What shall we render unto the Lord for all the benefits He hath done unto us? The Church tells us. The Church puts into our mouths the prayer that God's fatherly goodness would mercifully accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. The Church bids us say: "And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies." There is the sacrifice of the true penitent heart, there is the sacrifice of faith, there is the sacrifice of prayer, of thanksgiving, even of alms. But the Church does not speak of any other oblation. She does not regard her ministers as sacrificing priests standing before an "Altar." Her whole Liturgy is framed on an opposite view. It is a witness and a protest against Sacerdotalism. She knows of no earthly priests except presbyters or elders. She knows of no earthly sacrifices but spiritual sacrifices, and even these offered not by the minister for the people but by the whole congregation through the voice of the minister. "And here *we* offer and present unto Thee ourselves." She knows of no material altar: the very word has been expunged from her vocabulary. She bids us come to the Holy Table to partake of the Supper of the Lord, not to offer a sacrifice. She teaches us that there is but one Atoning Sacrifice, even that of the Lamb of God once offered. She teaches us that there is but one High Priest, even He who offered Himself without spot unto God upon the altar of the Cross. This is the teaching of the Church, and this is also the teaching of Scripture.

My Christian friends, I have finished a task which I have felt it a duty to undertake. It has not been a pleasant duty. I have no wish to engage in controversy. Yet at my ordination I pledged myself "to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Holy Word." I believe that the

doctrines of "the Real Presence and the Sacrifice in the Eucharist," *as they are now commonly taught* by too many clergymen, by some men of learning and position in the Church of England, are contrary to God's Holy Word. I see with sorrow and indignation how the poison of these doctrines is spreading; I see how the minds of the young and the unsuspecting are imposed upon by the specious claims that are urged by those who teach these doctrines as "Catholic" verities. I have felt it my duty to point out what I believe to be very serious errors. We know what the effect of teaching of this kind is. We know how it has led many to forsake our Communion for that of Rome. We know how perilously near to idolatry is that reverence which is inculcated for the "Blessed Sacrament." We know that our Church stigmatizes doctrines scarcely distinguishable from those which many of our clergy maintain as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." We are sure that in any case there is fostered by this teaching not a spirit of humble faith but a carnal and material conception of spiritual truths. Let us beware how we be led away into these errors. Keep close to the scriptural language, to the devout spiritual feeling of our own Liturgy. You want nothing more. You will find nothing better, truer, deeper, than is furnished there. You may crave some visible representation, something which as you think shall bring your Saviour nearer to you. Beware lest you repel Him. If He deigns to grant the unbelieving demand to see rather than to believe, that is not the highest or the most blessed condition. It still remains eternally true: "Because Thou hast seen me thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed."

See Note on page 79.

Note on the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

It is demonstrable that the doctrine of the continuous Sacrifice of Christ with its re-presentation in the Eucharist is not "the primitive and Catholic Doctrine." Let the following facts be weighed.

Jerome in his letter to Vigilantius speaking of the oblations in the Eucharist, speaks of them more than once as offerings made *to* Christ, never as the offering *of* Christ.

Augustine again and again asserts that the Sacrifice in the Eucharist is the Sacrifice of ourselves. He speaks indeed of the oblation or Sacrifice of the Bread before consecration, but says it is the sign of ourselves (not of Christ), Sermons ccxxvii, cclxxii and De Civ. D. xix, xxiii. "The Bread," he writes, "is received, is eaten, is consumed. Is the Body of Christ consumed? Is the Church of Christ consumed? Are the members of Christ consumed? Oh, no!" Before him Cyprian had a similar thought. Referring to the custom of mixing water with the wine, he says that the people are the water, and the wine the Blood of Christ, and that where these two are united there "is perfected the spiritual and heavenly Sacrament." If he did not understand the people to be really and objectively present under the water, neither did he hold that the Blood of Christ was really and objectively present in the wine.

Quite in accordance with the language of Jerome is that of many of the Ancient Liturgies. In the Syriac Liturgy of St. James the prayer is addressed to *our Lord*: "We offer to Thee this dread and bloodless sacrifice." Similarly in the Æthiopic Canon the offering of the bread and the cup is made *to Christ*. Both in this Canon and in the Coptic St. Basil the prayer of the first oblation is addressed to our Lord. In the Greek or Alexandrian St. Gregory we find the same thing, "Vouchsafe that these gifts may be offered to Thee; for Thou art the Sanctifier and the Sanctified, the Offerer and the Offered, &c., and to Thee we give glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit."

It is certain then that (1) in the Early Church as in our own the oblation was made of the elements before consecration; (2) that the offering was made to Christ; (3) that it was held by Augustine and by Cyprian to be the offering of ourselves, the Church, the mystical body of Christ.

For a full statement of the evidence I would refer my readers to a very valuable Pamphlet entitled "The Primitive Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as exhibited in Early Liturgies, by Clericus Cantabrigiensis," Second Edition, Deighton, Bell, & Co., 1877.